The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1923 NUMBER 428

Contents

The Week 304

Editorials
- Lincoln as Leader 306
- Can France Be Stopped? 308
- The Uses of Labor Shortage 310

General Articles
- Sèvres and Versailles ..... Arnold J. Toynbee 312
- The X-Ray: Its Use and Abuse ..... Nicholas and Lillian Kopeloff 314
- The Crimes of Law Enforcement. Austin Haines 316
- Three Things (Verse) ..... Joseph Auslander 318
- Goya ..... Thomas Craven 319

It Is the Lark ..... Stark Young 321

Correspondence 322

Reviews of Books
- A History of the Great War ..... X 324
- The Settlement Horizon ..... Lillian D. Wald 326
- Cooper's Letters ..... Percy H. Boynton 327
- English Wall Shadows ..... Harry Elmer Barnes 328
- Where Do We Go From Here? ..... Raymond Holden 329
- The Next Step ..... Stuart Chase 330

The Week

THE collapse of the Lausanne Conference creates a situation that is extremely menacing to the peace of the Near East and of the world. The Allied offers of settlement were liberal beyond anything that a nation with the record and the resources of the Turks could have hoped for. They were to return to rule or ruin Constantinople, their expulsion of Christian minorities was to receive Allied assent; the old régime of the capitulations was to give way to a new method of insuring the rights of Western nationals the adequacy of which appears extremely doubtful. But the Turks wanted more. They wanted practically the same jurisdiction over aliens resident in Turkey as the Western nations assume. They wanted freedom to cancel any or all concessions granted by the old Ottoman government. They had also their peculiar demands as to the distribution of the Ottoman debt between Turkey and the territories detached by the war. To grant those demands would have meant to impair seriously the interests of the Allies, especially of England. The British were ready to concede much for peace, but to concede everything might have involved a blow to British prestige in Asia from which it could not recover in decades.

RELATIONS between England and Turkey are not those of established peace, but are regulated solely by an armistice. The British are still holding Constantinople and other points in Turkish territory. Will the Turks try to expel them? From their mood at Lausanne we infer that they are entirely capable of making the attempt. The British government does not want war. It cannot afford it. The British people are sick of military adventure. Even if they were not, they would realize that they need to husband their resources against the possible crisis in Western European affairs. Nevertheless, they could not permit themselves to be thrown bodily out of Turkey. If the Turks insist on fighting, they will find the British prepared to take up the challenge. Better prepared, perhaps, than they surmise. Nobody knows anything about the recent movements of British naval and land forces, but it would be absurd to assume that British arms have simply been resting during the negotiations at Lausanne.

ANY illusion that the Anglo-French Entente still survives has been effectually dispelled by the action of Poincaré in assuring the Turks that France did not regard the terms submitted at Lausanne as final. There is some question as to whether the French procedure was loyal or not. If Lord Crew was fully informed in advance, the breach in the Entente was perhaps loyal. If the method taken by Poincaré was not a sufficiently clear announcement of his purpose, the charge of disloyalty stands. That, however, is a detail. The essential fact is that the Turks have assurance of French moral support in their resistance to England. The case is analogous to Zimmermann's coquetting with Mexico at the time when the Germans feared that America might enter the war against them. The Germans would have been overjoyed if a war had broken out on this continent to divert our attention from Europe. The French would be overjoyed if the British could have their attention diverted from the Ruhr by a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Turkish war. Officially France and England are still friendly nations, just as Germany and America were on January 1, 1917.

IN judging the terms for debt refunding accepted by the British government Americans will find it worth while to bear in mind that we are getting the best of a bad bargain. The aggregate of refunding bonds is worth more as a financial asset than the promissory notes they replace. British national credit was not impaired by the failure to pay interest on the promissory notes. It would be seriously impaired by failure to live up to the terms of the refunding loan. And the British cherish their national credit. The interest rate is low, for times like these, but it corresponds closely with the rate at which our government could borrow money, allowance made for the fact that we take back part of the interest on our national bonds in the form of supertaxes. We come out practically whole on our British loans, which is more than can be said for any other part of our war investments.

IF Congress must take or leave the terms as they stand, it would be the wiser part to take them. Nevertheless, there is one feature of the arrangement that it would be desirable to eliminate, if practicable. That is the privilege of paying the debt in United States bonds, to be accepted at par and accrued interest. There are at present several varieties of these bonds selling at not much above 98. If they remain at this price the British can save three million dollars a year by presenting them instead of cash. That is a small item, and most Americans assume that before long all national issues will go above par. But sixty-two years in a long period to speculate on. If we get mixed up in another war our bonds may go down to eighty or less. The gamble is all on the side of the British. Our administration assumes that British purchases of bonds will help to keep them at par. We could do that as well ourselves by purchasing bonds at the market price with the sums received from Britain. And we should not suffer from waves of suspicion of British manipulation every time our bonds happened to go down.

NOTWITHSTANDING his unjustifiable expectation that an economic conference called by this country is likely to be a serviceable agency in doing away with the essentially moral and political conflicts of the European peoples, Senator Borah is doing more to educate his fellow countrymen about the facts and values of European politics than all the other American political leaders put together. He alone points out how necessary it is once more to recognize Russia as a member of the family of nations. He alone proposes an explicit declaration by the American government which expresses disapproval of the French invasion of the Ruhr. He alone declares that "the Treaty of Versailles" as written "is destructive of the economic life of Europe" and "of the civilization of the world." He alone seems to understand that the failure of the United States to ratify the Treaty has placed the American government in a better rather than in a worse position eventually to furnish the only kind of assistance which has a chance of bringing law and order back to Europe. It is time for him to synthesize his various declarations into a comprehensive policy for the American government—a policy which included American participation in a new conference to which Russia and Germany were invited as equals and American economic assistance to Europe, provided the conference agreed to revise the economic and military sections of the Treaty so as to make them conform to the terms of the armistice.

BISHOP MANNING does not emerge from the exchange of notes between himself and the Rev. Percy Stickney Grant with any too much credit. If he did not intend to go through with the attempt to try Dr. Grant and if possible to exclude the offending rector from the Episcopal Church as a heretic, he would have done better not to have raised the issue. Sensible people attach no more importance to his "rebuke" of Dr. Grant than they would to a rebuke of (say) William Randolph Hearst in the New York Times. Of course it is easy to understand what happened. The Bishop was forced to write his first threatening letter by the pressure of the fire-eating fundamentalists in his own diocese. But on reflection he did not dare to go through. A trial for heresy is at once a hazardous and somewhat ridiculous performance which is certain seriously to injure the unity and the prestige of the church. All the good citizens of the Episcopalian body politic for whom the path of salvation lies precisely along the middle of the road began to use their influence to prevent the trial, and as they are the most influential part of the membership of all Protestant sects they naturally succeeded. The Episcopal Church of America is saved from a scandal and a possible schism, but the price is heavy. Episcopalians are instructed not to ask embarrassing questions about the meaning of the Apostles Creed, or if they must do so, to ask and answer them in private.

GOVERNOR PINCHOT has started to relieve the state of Pennsylvania of a peculiarly flagrant abuse of its police authority. It has been the custom for the governors of that state to issue to corporations commissions for special policemen in any numbers which the corporation managers demanded and without any inquiry as to the character of the armed and uniformed agent. During the past two years some 5,800 of these com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missions were issued, of which 3,500 went to the coal and iron and 2,200 to the railroad companies. As compared to these 5,800 private policemen, the state force numbered on the average about 370 men. These armed guards usually wore a uniform closely resembling that of the state police; and they were used during the coal strike in many districts to terrorize the local population and to cut off communication between the strikers and their comrades in other districts. It is an abominable method of protecting property, which in practice places the power and the prestige of the state at the service of one of the parties to an industrial dispute. In fact it is tantamount to a surrender by the state of its most essential function to private partisan agencies. Governor Pinchot does not propose to abolish it, but he does intend, as long as he is governor, to inquire carefully into the fitness of the individuals to whom these state commissions are granted. It remains to be seen whether such precautions will be sufficient.

OVERRIDING excited cries of "free speech" and "free press" the New York Federation of Women's Clubs, at a meeting of some two thousand of its members, emphatically voted down motions urging the repeal of the Lusk laws and the Motion Picture Censorship. We have no real argument with citizens who support measures so repressive as the Lusk laws: presumably they know what they want and will be content if they get exactly that. But with the motion picture censorship the case is different. The voices raised on behalf of the censorship were not all those of militant conservatives. There were among them many mothers who want to see their children protected from the perpetual reiteration of sex and crime motifs in the pictures. But the censorship can only guarantee the rejection of definitely tabooed scenes and subjects; and meanwhile it directs the attention of the producer to the letter rather than the spirit of the law. No general improvement in the films is implied, and the automatic deletion of certain offensive scenes can scarcely begin to make up for the sacrifice of an active awareness of public social responsibility for decent films. Mothers who would willingly, for the sake of young and untrained tastes, enforce a public censorship, would do well in the interests of their own case to reconsider. No legal censorship, however well administered, can be a fit substitute for the enlightened criticism which it automatically cuts off.

THE appeal of the German workers to our Congress deserves serious consideration. America did make a positive promise that upon the extirpation of autocracy the Germans should enjoy a peace of right and justice. True, it was through the words of Woodrow Wilson that we made the promise, but to say that it was Wilson who promised, not America, would be to follow the precedent of the Greek crook who pleaded, as a bar to a contract, "My tongue promised it, not I." We promised; we substituted, for a peace by negotiation between evenly matched contestants, a peace by conclusive victory, in which ourselves and our Allies proposed and disposed as we would. And the outcome has been the creation of conditions under which the new German democracy has scarcely been able to survive. The least we can honorably do as a nation is to assure the German democracy of our moral support in its fight against counter-revolution at home and military exploitation from abroad.

NOT immediate financial returns, but breaking the German will, is the currently avowed official objective of the Ruhr invasion. Will breaking, however, is a difficult and uncertain process. There is no established technique for it, as applied by one great nation to another. But the empirical rule is obvious: proceed from severe measures to yet more severe, and hold extreme measures in reserve. The French contented themselves at first with the affront to nationalism that actual occupation represented. Next came the arrest of officials, then the customs cordon and the cutting off of coal supplies for unoccupied Germany. At present the forward movement of the French is taking the form of occupation of additional territory. Soon we shall hear of an ultimatum in preparation setting a date when the Rhineland will be wrested from the Reich unless Germany yields. What if even that fails to bring the Germans to terms? There remains the device of starvation.

Lincoln as Leader

PESSIMISTS frequently assert that now for the first time the American Republic at a critical moment in its history seems unable to develop salutary leadership. Where is the successor to Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt and Wilson? The American people are clearly confronted with a question as difficult and as dangerous to answer as the questions which they answered by founding the federal government or by electing Lincoln. They need a popular leader who will himself see the way out of the existing deadlock in foreign policy and will convince them of the wisdom of his proposals. Why is he not forthcoming? Is the American nation losing the aptitude for self-government which it is supposed to share with its British relative?

These are useful questions to ask even though the answers to them are unsatisfactory. Political psychology has never sufficiently investigated what happens in a democracy when it gives birth to a leader and what a leader actually does when he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leads. But there is one acknowledged case of leadership in American history which is, perhaps, the most perfect of its kind and which is peculiarly worth analysis in relation to the existing deadlock. We refer to the leadership which Abraham Lincoln gave to his fellow countrymen during the crisis of the slavery conflict from 1858 to 1863.

There was a period of more than thirty years, beginning with the Missouri Compromise, during which constructive leadership on the part of American statesmen was as much lacking in the treatment of Negro slavery as it now is in the treatment of the great issue of world appeasement. The Constitution authorized white people to own black people as slaves. Yet the Republic was in its political ideology democratic, and according to the democratic ideal it was clearly intolerable for one human being to own property rights in another human being. Throughout a whole generation American political leaders either perverted this conflict or shirked it. The slave-holders insisted on the righteousness of their peculiar institution and its necessary permanence. They proposed to dedicate the future of the American nation to it by propagating it in the soil out of which the new states would grow. The abolitionists considered slavery an abomination and preferred to break up the Union rather than assume responsibility for its legal existence. Between them were the compromisers, consisting in part of pioneer democrats who believed that even slavery could be cleansed of its impurities provided it were sanctioned by the will of a local popular majority, and in part of constitutional unionists who were indifferent to the incompatibility between democratic ideology and legalized slavery. They worshipped the Constitution and possessed a mystic faith in its ability to cure automatically all the ills which its operation generated. The compromisers dictated the policy of the country from 1820 to 1856. Throughout these years they kept the Union together by dividing the national domain so far as possible into an equal number of slave and free states and so perpetuating a nation whose soil was half slave and half free. The Union under the Constitution remained politically united only by virtue of preferring to be morally divided.

Such a combination of moral conflict and political cooperation obviously could not last. After the Mexican war had added possible slave territory to the Republic, the parties which believed slavery right and the parties which believed slavery wrong both became more aggressive. The slave holders sought systematically to nationalize slavery by legalizing it throughout the public domain; the opponents of slavery to denationalize it by excluding it from the public domain. The aggressive action of the slave-holders in repealing the Missouri Compromise forced their opponents to launch a counter attack against slavery; and the Republican party, dedicated to the restriction of slavery and to the preservation of the Union, came into existence. But a party which proposed both to restrict slavery and to keep the Union alive obviously threatened to provoke the South into secession; and the utterance of any such provocation by a large body of responsible citizens filled the minds of many excellent Americans with horror and dismay. They had acted for a generation as if the only way to preserve the Union was to connive at the extension of slavery. The Union meant to them, not common devotion to a democratic ideal of human freedom and equality, but common allegiance to the Constitution. The Constitution having recognized slavery, slavery was sacrosanct. They regarded Republicanism as only a shade better than abolitionism, and preferred to give any guarantees about the future preservation of slavery rather than assume the risk of getting rid of it.

Abraham Lincoln's first service to his countrymen as a leader was his exposure of the impossibility of this apprehensive and evasive sacrifice of the moral integrity of the American nation to its immediate political safety. The Union, he said, could not persist half slave and half free—a house divided against itself. It must fall or else cease to be divided. By his use of this figure, at once so simple and so adequate, he disentangled the essential issue and placed an emphasis upon it which indicated the only constructive way out. He taught his countrymen to look the ugly choice which the aggressiveness of the South had forced upon them squarely in the face. It was not possible to preserve the Union merely by preserving the Union. In order to preserve the Union they had to risk the Union by denationalizing slavery. They had to resist the South, to proclaim the unrighteousness of slavery, to arrange for its restriction and even to look in the direction of its ultimate extinction. He supplied the need of leadership, because better than any other Republican, he understood and faced all the realities of the crisis, and because, once having mastered them, his mind and his will never relaxed their grip. After his election he preferred secession and war to any commerce with the Crittenden compromise, which sought with a naïve faith in verbal contracts to avoid disunion by writing slavery indelibly on the parchment of the Constitution. He knew that American national unity would recover more quickly even from war than it would from the renewed moral recognition of slavery. And after the war started he showed an uncanny insight in launching the Emancipation Proclamation at the moment when it would do most to rescue the Union from the dangers which the fight against slavery had precipitated. The Emancipation Proclamation was his Fourteen Points. He never swerved from his task until he had cleared away the obstacles to the achievement of his great war aim.

Now consider for a moment what kind of serv-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ice Mr. Lincoln rendered to his fellow countrymen and the conditions which finally enabled him to render it. From 1820 until 1856 the attitudes of the different groups in relation to slavery prohibited the existence of constructive national leadership. It was, of course, as possible in 1830 for a political analyst to have stated the problem of slavery in relation to the future of the Union as Mr. Lincoln stated it in 1858, but if he had attempted in 1830 to convert any large number of his fellow countrymen to it, he would have failed. The conflicting interests and ideals had not sufficiently matured to disclose with sufficient clarity their veritable impulses and liabilities. The spokesmen of these interests and ideals were not prepared to recognize the realities and to assume the risks which the active assertion of their own convictions demanded. Nor were they prepared to face the loss which would certainly follow in the event of failure. Constructive national leadership did not become possible until the most powerful and aggressive special interest—that of the slave-holder —used its power to identify American nationality with the methodical expansion of slavery.

Until then leaders like Henry Clay and Daniel Webster could plausibly associate the preservation of the Union with the perpetuation of slavery. Thereafter Unionists had to face the truth that a commonwealth dedicated to popular government must either exclude slavery or surrender to its hateful demands. The aggressive behavior of the South which was born of the logic of an inhumane and anti-social institution precipitated the issue and prevented any further evasion of its ugly alternatives. Those who wished to preserve the Union must resist the South and act as the declared enemies of slavery. The attitude of the South forced them to risk disunion, to place the responsibility for it on slavery and finally to invoke emancipation as an instrument of future reunion. Lincoln's leadership consisted first in stating the disagreeable truth of the conflict, in indicating the only possible way out, in assuming the risk of taking that road and in keeping the confidence of his fellow countrymen long enough to carry the policy through to success.

There are many striking analogies between the predicament of public opinion and the consequent absence of constructive leadership in relation to slavery as it existed in the United States before 1858 and the predicament of public opinion and the absence of leadership with respect to foreign policy as it has existed since the spring of 1919. The Treaty of Versailles, like the Constitution of the United States before the Civil War, established what was intended to be an indissoluble marriage between the fabric of political order and a morally disorderly institution. The peace of Europe was confided to a document which deprived one of the great European peoples of security and independence. The great majority of the friends of international peace and cooperation, like the constitutional unionists before the Civil War, has disregarded the moral disorder in the interest of immediate political safety. The way to cooperate was to cooperate—even though by cooperating the friends of peace would recognize and tend to perpetuate an irresistible legal provocation to future war. By this attitude they have encouraged France, just as the unionist compromisers had encouraged aggression by the slave-holders, to pursue successfully the task of subjecting and destroying Germany. They have enabled her to go ahead without any apparent misgiving about the righteousness of her conduct.

The policy of France since she has occupied the Ruhr, like the policy of the South after the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, has exposed the futility of cooperation at any price. The way to cooperate is to recognize the chief immediate obstacle to successful cooperation and to associate the cooperative process with its removal. In 1858 it was the legal existence of slavery. In 1923 it is those clauses of the Treaty of Versailles which treat Germany as a criminal, which in effect confiscate the property of the German people, destroy their security, undermine the authority of their government and deprive them of any chance of national self-respect. In both cases there is no way of getting rid of the morally indefensible legal institution without risking and accepting the necessity of temporary disorder and without resisting the class or the nation which provokes this disorder. The Treaty of Versailles divides Europe against itself, and Europe will either destroy the Treaty or be destroyed by it. That is the truth which public opinion here and abroad must recognize before the American government can do anything effective to help Europe. The statesman who would repeat Lincoln's service to his fellow countrymen must undertake the job of bringing this truth home to the American people. He must be willing, if necessary, to approach international union through disunion and the creation of a permanent society of nations by accepting for the time being a period of disorder. Now that France has acted and revealed the veritable motives and the manifest effect of her policy, there is no longer any room for illusion. The civilized world must thwart her present plans before it can recover its own self-possession.

Can France Be Stopped?

THE war between France and Germany is rapidly approaching a new, more explosive and more dangerous phase. The passive resistance of Germany has forced on France the adoption of more drastic coercive measures. The French government is now cutting off the rest of Germany from the Ruhr and depriving the Ruhr

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population of food and the rest of Germany of coal. The embargo will in a few weeks result in immense suffering. The infliction of this suffering on the whole German population is, of course, the very essence of the French policy. France intends, as General Degoutte says, to impose her will on the German nation at any cost. If they resist they must starve or rot from disease. The question is: What will happen when the hunger and the suffering are no longer bearable. Will the Cuno government give way to another government which will recognize the French occupation of the Ruhr and exchange German self-respect, security and independence for the small supplies of coal and food which the magnanimity of M. Poincaré will allow them to consume? Or will their self-control break under the strain and will armed bodies roll up in Bavaria, East Prussia and other less accessible parts of Germany which will prefer to fight rather than yield?

In our opinion the second alternative is the more probable. In spite of the hopelessness of armed resistance from a military point of view, the spring is not likely to pass without fighting in Germany. The Germans are desperate. Increasing numbers of them would rather die by French bombs and bullets than live the impoverished and ignoble existence which the French offer to them as an alternative. There are certain advantages from the German point of view in substituting open warfare for the less bloody but equally deadly conflict which is now taking place. In the event of actual fighting, the French would be responsible for the nourishment of the population in the districts they invade, in which case there might be actually less starvation. Then the larger the territory which the French can be forced to occupy, the greater the strain it would be for them to carry on the war and the weaker their position would become. Whether the Germans are capable of putting up any effective resistance is a question which we do not know enough to answer. Mr. Arnold J. Toynbee in an article published elsewhere in this issue guesses that they are. In any event every humane individual must shudder at the anguish which resistance will bring to millions of men, women and children in Germany, to the malignant hatreds which it will inflame and to the permanent scar which it will leave on the physiognomy of Europe as a Christian community. It is for the German people to decide whether their liberty is worth the wreckage and the anguish which its vindication will demand. For our part we hope that they will refuse either to fight or to consent. If their position becomes intolerable, they can ask M. Poincaré to take over the responsibility of governing a country which no longer belongs to its own inhabitants.

There is still little or no understanding in this country of the true nature and the inevitable consequences of the French invasion of the Ruhr Basin. The majority of those who are opposed to it condemn it as futile rather than as maleficent and barbarous. It is not in the least futile. It is by way of accomplishing all that its authors intend it to accomplish, viz. the subjection and ruin of Germany. American public opinion has a long way to travel before it will realize the immense scope of the disaster which befell the welfare of Europe when France started on this adventure. British public opinion is as usual much more alert. An increasingly influential fraction of it is demanding the adoption by the British government of a frankly hostile attitude towards the French invasion of Germany. One of the British weeklies, the New Statesman, declares that "the deliberate destruction of German industry is something which Great Britain cannot and will not tolerate. We shall be obliged to take a hand in this new war, as in all European wars which have involved the issue of hegemony. France must abandon her present purposes or we shall be forced definitely to enter the lists against her and to oppose her by every means in our power short of actual violence. . . . The French are our enemies again,—as they have been for a thousand years."

In the foregoing passage the New Statesman indicates the attitude which in the end not only Great Britain but the United States will have to adopt. Considering the existing condition of American public opinion, considering the ardent support of France by a small but powerful and vociferous minority, the merely lukewarm and conciliatory disapproval of French behavior by the friends of international cooperation and the massive indifference of the great body of American public opinion to the whole matter, the taking of joint action by Great Britain and America in opposition to France seems at this moment scarcely credible. But in November 1914, when Theodore Roosevelt urged the desirability of a protest by the American government against the occupation of Belgium, it would have been even more incredible to have predicted the eventual despatch to France of 2,000,000 American protectors of Belgium. The evil genius which prompted the German government to invade Belgium also prompted it to violate the American frontier and threaten the security of the maritime highways. And the evil genius which has prompted France to take advantage of the defencelessness of Germany and attempt the permanent destruction of her ancient enemy, will compel her to undertake further offences against international right which will leave Great Britain and then the United States no alternative but to enter the lists against her. They will not allow a war which cost the English-speaking peoples so dear to bring about the destruction for an indefinite future of European peace, security and progress without at least trying to prevent the calamity.

It by no means follows that they will succeed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Great Britain is still far from being sufficiently aroused to pursue at any time in the near future the course suggested by the New Statesman, and the United States is not aroused at all. Before they are ready to act the damage may well become from the point of view of the present generation irreparable. Moreover as soon as they are ready to act, they will find it extremely difficult to devise a method of intervention which will be effective in defeating France without weakening her so much that she will be exposed to the vengeance of the people whom she is now so cruelly humiliating and injuring. What can the English-speaking governments actually do "short," as the New Statesman says, "of actual violence" to prevent France from ruining Germany? The words seem to imply the imposition of blockade which would prohibit France from buying anything abroad and would enable Germany to obtain supplies. A blockade might do the trick, but the French government would almost certainly answer its imposition by a declaration of war which would force the British to arm Germany; and if they re-armed Germany and Germany were victorious, how could they prevent the Germans who are themselves in a most vindictive state of mind, from abusing the new victory?

There is probably no way except actual war of compelling France to abandon her plan of ruining Germany; and the despatch of British and American troops or ships to the continent of Europe to fight for Germany against France, only a few years after they had fought to save France from Germany, would be too colossally and tragically grotesque a piece of historic irony even for the lord of armed hosts to perpetrate. The only deterrent which Great Britain and the United States can invoke is that of moral coercion. If the moral coercion is to succeed it will have to compensate for its inoffensiveness by its patience, its definiteness and its firmness. It might take the form of a joint communication by Great Britain and the United States announcing the suspension of diplomatic relations with France until she evacuated the Ruhr, agreed to revise the Treaty of Versailles and abandon its military sanctions and was ready to indemnify Germany from the reparations account for the damage she had inflicted by the invasion. A protest of this kind might not prevent France from ruining Germany and from postponing the recovery of Europe for perhaps a generation, but it would be certain in the end to force the retirement of France. Any success which it won would tend to be salutary. It would strengthen the prestige of peaceful as opposed to warlike methods in dealing with international quarrels. It would be tantamount to a wager upon the ultimate good sense of the French people—upon their readiness to repudiate the cruel egotism of their own government as soon as they understood the full measure of the suffering which it inflicted on their victims and the full measure of abhorrence and distrust which it was bound to create in the minds of their former friends.

The Uses of Labor Shortage

THERE can be no doubt that labor shortage, as employers define the term, is upon us. At a given level of wages it is increasingly difficult to procure common labor. Our industrial system, in the pre-war period, was gauged to an unremitting influx of alien labor. We counted unconsciously on that influx, just as British industry counted on an uninterrupted importation of wheat, meat, cotton and copper. Both calculations were upset by the war, our own the more seriously.

Our pre-war consumption of alien labor may be measured roughly by the gross immigration, which averaged 1,054,000 annually for the five years ending with June 1914. For the three years after the peace, 1920-22, the corresponding figure is 514,000. A better measure of the actual additions to the alien labor supply is the net immigration, or the number of alien immgrants less the number of emigrants. The average net annual immigration for the five years preceding the outbreak of the war was 663,000. For the five war years the average net immigration dropped to 86,000, and in the three years of peace following, the average was 277,000. If immigration had continued through the eght years 1915-22 at the same rate as for the five years 1910-14, there would have been 3,700,000 more aliens in the country at the end of the fiscal year 1922 than was actually the case. This estimate allows liberally for the death rate. Assuming that two-thirds of these aliens would have been adult laborers, the war and the post-war depression have cost our industry the service of 2,500,000 persons.

It may appear, on first thought, that the colossal disturbances created by the war must have reduced the demand for labor in America at the same time that it reduced the supply of it. The world as a whole is on short commons, and the demands on industry must have been correspondingly relaxed. This may hold true of the world as a whole, but it does not appear to apply to America. During the war and after it American exports have been on a much higher level than ever before. For the five years preceding the outbreak of the war the exports of domestic products averaged $2,100,000,000; for the three years 1920-22 the average was $6,033,000,000. Grant that the meaning of the latter figure is obscured by price inflation, it still remains true that we are exporting almost twice as much, in physical quantities, as we did before the war.

Must we assume, then, that our own consumption has slackened in its development? Domestic consumption is shrouded in a mist of uncertainties.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Everyone knows of certain directions in which development suffered a check, as for example building operations during the war and railway construction during the war and down to the present time. But we do not know of any competent authority on industry who maintains that consumption in general has been checked. According to the estimates of the National Bureau of Economic Research the national income for the five years 1910-14 averaged $32,100,000,000. Equally authoritative estimates for 1920-22 are wanting, but from various reliable sources we surmise that an average of $60,000,000,000 would not be far wrong. Here again price inflation enters to complicate the problem, but it is improbable that the increase in real purchasing power is less than twenty-five per-cent. And most of this increase must have gone to swell the demand for the products of American industry.

The demands upon American production, both for home consumption and for exportation, have increased rapidly since 1914. It would be possible to show that the rate of increase has been greater than in the period preceding the war, in spite of the deficit in the import of labor. We do not, however, maintain the thesis that production has got on better without those 2,500,000 alien laborers than it would have got on with them. America might have made still more remarkable strides in production if nothing had happened to reduce the influx of alien labor. The cardinal point here is that America is capable of vigorous growth without the artificial stimulus of imported labor.

So much for results. But one is puzzled as to how it was done. There cannot have been so large a proportion of our workers unemployed, or partially employed, in 1920-22 as in 1910-14. Probably the high price of labor stimulated managers to find more rational ways of handling it. Probably an impetus has been given to the application of labor saving machinery. The efficiency engineers long ago demonstrated that the waste of potential labor power in industry is scandalous. Blocking the easy road of labor importation concentrates the attention of management upon the problems of economy of labor. That is all to the good. Still more to the good is the reduction in unemployment.

But what is much more important is the effect upon the general social-economic position of the working class. The alien labor of pre-war times was an instrument of production, indeed, but it was also a weapon in the hands of the employer to beat down the demands of American and Americanized labor. The practices of the coal and steel barons are too notorious to need more than mention. The twelve-hour day and starvation wages are direct corollaries of the unrestrained immigration of the period before 1914. If we can hold the gates closed for another decade, those abuses are bound to go.

Not everybody in America would like this. Nor would everybody in America be pleased with another natural consequence of restriction, that it will draw more and more Negroes out of the rural South, especially the lynching belt, for common labor in the industries. Still another consequence is the strengthening of trade unions. What happens when the whole working body in an industry is American or thoroughly Americanized is exemplified in the four great railway Brotherhoods. The "master and man" relation no longer obtains in the railway industry, but instead the relation of man and man. If there is anywhere in the world a body of men more self-respecting and more capable of commanding respect for their rights than the Brotherhood membership, we regret that it has escaped our notice.

If the immigration dikes hold, we shall presently have many more trades as firmly organized, as dangerous to trifle with, as alive to their personal rights and public duties as the railway men. That may not be best for production. Mr. Gary might not get out as much steel and as large steel profits if he had to do business with men like Chief Stone.

But the real need of America is something other than abundance of steel and coal, woolens and cottons, gewgaws and gimcracks. America needs men, men who can stand as upright under physical labor as under any other respectable form of effort. And we shall get them by the Brotherhood plan, not by the Gary plan. But while we are holding up the alien tide to enable the American workman to establish himself in a position of self-respect comporting with the ideals of democracy, we need not despair of abundant production. It was long ago demonstrated, even to the satisfaction of the slave owners,, that the slave cannot match the hired laborer in productiveness. It will yet be demonstrated that the most productive of men is the man who is really free.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1923, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y, HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER; DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY — ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
ALVIN JOHNSON — STARK YOUNG
PHILIP LITTELL — ROBERT LITTELL

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
JANE ADDAMS — JOHN DEWEY
BRUCE BLIVEN — DAVID FRIDAY
H. N. BRAILSFORD — R. H. TAWNEY
LEO WOLMAN

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sèvres and Versailles

INABILITY to profit by experience is a characteristic and disastrous feature of the "post war" frame of mind. Seven weeks ago, a conference met at Lausanne in order to bury with diplomatic honors the Treaty of Sèvres, dead of the wound inflicted by the Greek landing at Smyrna in May 1919. And at this moment, of all moments, the French, of all nations, are deliberately striking a blow of the very same kind at their own particular idol, the Treaty of Versailles. French diplomacy has shown itself acute enough in criticizing the mistakes of foreign colleagues. At a very early stage in the malady of the now defunct Turkish treaty, the Quai d'Orsay realized that death was bound to supervene, and that the stolid optimism of Downing Street would merely prolong the patient's agony without saving his life. Now, apparently, the rôles are to be reversed, and Great Britain is to enjoy the barren satisfaction of standing by impotently while France pursues a mistaken policy to disaster, and of saying "I told you so" when the catastrophe occurs. We seem all to have lost our judgment except in regard to the affairs of others. How much more wholesome it would be if we judged rightly of our own!

Anyone who has been studying the course of events in the Near East during the last four years cannot fail to foresee a definite train of consequences, and that a very gloomy one, emanating from the momentous steps which France has just taken. The parallel may be misleading. No two sets of circumstances are ever identical. But in this case the points of similarity are so striking, and the French advance, like the Greek landing, is by its very nature so irrevocable, that the accomplished facts in the East give a more substantial basis for prophecy about a future to which we cannot be indifferent, than any other data at present available.

On one fundamental point the parallel is already working itself out. The psychological effect of French military action on the Germans, like that of Greek military action in 1919 upon the Turks, has been immediate and profound. In a moment, it has displaced the abnormal mentality of defeat and replaced it, not by the normal average of human combativeness but by the more formidable courage of despair. Hitherto, the Treaty of Versailles has been just bearable for the Germans because it has at any rate been a lesser evil than the European War. Now Versailles is developing into something worse than the worst ruin, starvation and paralysis of 1914-18, and four years after the armistice, nonresistance has reached the point of diminishing returns. Nor, if she resists now, will Germany have the same forces arrayed against her as when she was beaten to her knees. She has not this time to fear a British blockade, and the French and Belgian armies will not find the British and American armies at their side, nor the Italian army, nor even (for Russia will see to that) the armies of the Little Entente. True, this war will be fought (if it is fought) in the heart of Germany, while the other ravaged the fields and cities of France. But in a war of desperation, it is a military advantage to be the invaded party. During the recent war, this was the mainstay of French morale; the same iron necessity of ejecting the invader has since then steeled the troops of Mustapha Kemal. Can anyone doubt that the Germans will fight, if now driven to it, as stubbornly as the French in 1914-18, the Turks in 1919-22, and their own German ancestors in 1812-13, in order to liberate the soil of their Fatherland? And can anyone expect that French soldiers will make the same sacrifices for the Ruhr and the Rhineland as for Champagne and the Ile de France?

Of course, if the Germans resist by force of arms (in addition to the passive resistance which they are putting up already) they will not do so in the Ruhr and now. That is physically impossible for a disarmed country. The resistance will begin at the opposite end of Germany, well out of the immediate reach of the French right arm. The strategy will be one of exhaustion, relying on the isolation of France; her limited ability, after a first-class war of defence, to carry through a first-class war of aggression; and, above all, on time. If the "Putsch" takes place (and if it does, it will be in the next month or two), it will start where the previous unsuccessful (because insufficiently stimulated) "Putsches" have started, that is, in the provinces northeast of Berlin. Everything points to this locality: the remoteness from the bases of the French military power; the local strength of the Prussian spirit; the traditions of 1812-13; the passion of irredentism against France's protegé Poland; and, not least, the proximity of Russia. Mustapha Kemal unfurled his standard at Erzerum and Sivas and planted it at Angora; his German counterpart may declare himself at Küstrin or Breslau and rapidly establish himself at Berlin. To this extent the German would have the advantage that, whereas the Turk's capital lay at the further extremity of his country and was already in the hands of the Allies, the capital of Germany lies close to the national centres of revolt, and is not so easy to march upon from the Rhine and the Ruhr.

It will be objected at once that Germany has not the impregnability of Anatolia. Instead of being an agricultural country almost devoid of commu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nications, she is an industrial country with the best railway system in the world. But the military weaknesses (as they are, for this kind of war) of industrialism and accessibility are by no means so pronounced in Germany east of the Elbe as in Germany as a whole, and formidable obstacles to conquest are latent in mere extent of territory and density of (an exasperated) population. A great modern city is a hostage, but a hostage, by sacrificing himself, may overwhelm his captor. How many classes of her conscript army would France have to call up in order to hold a line of communications stretching to Berlin and beyond, with every German city up in arms behind the invader's front? And when the atrocities inevitable in dealing with a "people's war" occurred, would not France suffer the same imponderable but deadly damage from the world's condemnation as Germany suffered when she trampled on Belgium? The French army would find itself committed to the task of the Danaïdes, for a great country and people, however thoroughly disorganized and disarmed, can seldom be held down physically, from end to end, by another. No country was ever more prostrate than France was after Sedan. Yet in 1871 the Germans, while investing Paris with irresistible force, were by no means invincible on the Somme or the Loire, and never had any prospect of penetrating to the Garonne or the Mediterranean. In all probability, the dream of marching to Berlin, if any Frenchman now entertains it, is equally impracticable; and northeast of Berlin a German provisional government could defy France if the German nation were prepared, as it probably would be, to pay the price of resistance.

The "National Pact" to which such a government would pledge itself can, in outline, be predicted: it would repudiate Versailles and take its stand on the Russian platform of "no indemnities or annexations." It would hardly be so unwise as to reopen the questions of Alsace-Lorraine or Schleswig, but it would certainly demand the unconditional reunion of the Saar, the Rhineland and the Ruhr, of Dantzig, Posen, West Prussia and Upper Silesia. And in regard to this second group of demands, at any rate, it would find a wholehearted ally in Russia.

At the moment, the Baltic States, Lithuania and Poland isolate North Eastern Germany from Russia, just as the Trans-Caucasian Republics, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia separated Anatolia from Russia at the time when Mustapha Kemal started the Turkish movement against the Treaty of Sèvres. Within eighteen months of that memorable date, the feeble barriers between two inevitable allies were swept away, and Turkey and Russia joined hands across the Caucasus in order to cooperate against their common Western enemies. Is there any greater solidity in the artificial and composite dyke which Allied diplomacy has so laboriously erected between Russia and Germany? The attack on Memel by Lithuanian irregulars is a straw which shows the direction of the wind. There is a superficial incongruity in the fact that while the main French army is invading Germany at one end, a detachment of French troops is defending a local German administration at the opposite extremity of the Reich. In reality, however, France is not so much concerned to save the Germans of Memel from falling under Lithuanian dominion as to prevent Lithuania from becoming a corridor between Germany and Russia through obtaining an outlet to the Baltic. This was what Russia meant to make of Lithuania in 1920, when the Soviet armies traversed that little country in their abortive offensive against Warsaw; and Lithuania willingly adapted herself to the rôle, for though she may not love Russia and Germany, her hatred is concentrated upon Poland, who has deprived her of Vilna already and threatens to swallow the rest of her territories. When Germany and Russia combine to break down the Polish barrier, Lithuania will do her best to help them, as Turkey and Russia were at any rate passively helped in the Caucasus by Georgia. Like the latter country, Lithuania may possible repent later on, but by that time the deed will be impossible to undo. For in the meantime Riga and the Baltic States will have been reincorporated in Russia (to whom they are as indispensable as Baku and Azerbaijan); and the Poles will have suffered (and that far more justly) the fate of the Armenians. They will lose first the vast non-Polish territories which they are at present holding by sheer force, and secondly much that is by rights their own; and if a Polish Republic survives under the joint hegemony of Germany and Russia, it will be a modest affair, cut off from the sea and not including much beyond Warsaw and Cracow. This, one may perhaps venture to prophesy, will happen between fifteen and eighteen months from now, in the East European campaigning season of 1924. It will be the first serious blow which the German-Russian Alliance will be able to strike at France—a terrible blow, though indirect in its immediate impact—and the French will no more be able to avert it by advancing to the line of the Elbe than the Greeks could save the Republic of Erivan in 1920 by seizing Ushak and Brusa. How soon after this will the Grand Alliance of the Vanquished be able to deal France the knock-out blow?

Unhappily, the struggle is likely to be drawn out to the uttermost, for nothing less will be at stake than finis Galliae as a great power. The franc will have to fall very low, the depleted manhood of France will have to be decimated twice over, before the belated but inevitable and this time final débâcle occurs. And what will be the state of Europe by the time that France collapses? Finis Galliae may mean finis Europae too, and in that event the beneficiary will be Russia. What would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tsar Nicholas have thought seventy years ago, if Germany and Islam had offered themselves simultaneously to be his myrmidons against France and England? Would he not have felt, as he took in the full import of this unnatural and incredible miracle, that the most extravagant ambitions of Peter the Great and Catherine were now within his grasp? Today, Russian imperialism has stronger cards in its hands than at any moment since its first conception in the perverse mind of man; and as Napoleon, within a year or two of the weakness and confusion of the Revolution, realized the dreams of Louis XIV, so the present rulers of Russia may "accomplish the historical mission of the Tsardom" within a decade of the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. If anything at all is constructed out of the pitiful ruins of Sèvres and Versailles, it will be a Russian hegemony over the Continent and the Middle East.

ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE.

The X-Ray: Its Use and Abuse

HAVE you a little skeleton in your closet? The stoutest doors cannot protect it from the eye of the X-ray. Frailties of the flesh, abnormalities of the bone—the X-ray can expose them with little difficulty and less time. To "see through a person" has become more than a phrase—it is now a fact. But just as the next step to discovering an error is its correction, so this marvelous force in the hands of science, having shown where the evil lies, can be made to supply the remedy.

Not a few scientific discoveries of the highest order first made their appearance as fortuitous accidents. Roentgen, working with vacuum tubes, it is related, was suddenly called from his room. He laid the bulb, still glowing, on a book he had been reading in which lay a large, flat, antique key used as a bookmark. Underneath this book there happened to lie a photographic plate holder which he had prepared for the afternoon's outing. Later on while developing some plates, a shadow of the antique key appeared upon the fateful plate. Searching for the source of the invisible light which was responsible for this unique phenomenon, he restaged the scene and energized the vacuum tube as on the preceding day. The shadow was on the plate and the Roentgen or X-ray was discovered, thenceforth to illumine the sciences of medicine and physics.

The earliest efforts with the X-ray dealt with the finding of broken bones or foreign bodies such as coins, pins, bullets and similar small objects. Today there is scarcely a branch of surgical or internal medicine which does not make daily use of the X-ray. Exact knowledge of the condition of the lungs, so vital in tuberculosis, is obtained by this means, as is the determination of diseases of the urinary tract. The way to reach a man's heart may be through his stomach, but that is not the route generally taken by the physician: both are too much in the dark. By swallowing tasteless solutions containing some opaque substance, such as bismuth, it has been possible with the aid of the X-ray to study the size, contour and motility of the stomach which in turn has led to some of the most important discoveries concerning the activity of the human stomach and intestines. Furthermore, gallstones, ulcers and tumors have been detected in time to save the lives of many patients. No one who visits the dentist these days takes cognizance of the few seconds needed for the X-ray pictures, but keeps an ever watchful eye on the drill, chiefly concerned as to the depth and amount of drilling. Yet it is that small picture which is the determining factor in the procedure which ensues. Many a tooth, sound to all outward appearances and even quite painless, may be the source of infection which is frequently associated with rheumatism, kidney, eye and other diseases. The X-ray makes treatment in good time a possibility for the up-to-date dentist.

Just how an X-ray picture is "read" is a matter of more than passing interest. Adequate reading of X-ray pictures presupposes comprehensive knowledge and experience on the part of the one who is rendering the diagnosis. Yet some of the more common conditions such as tooth abscesses, impactions, etc. can be readily interpreted by the layman. Thus one merely holds the negative or film which has been developed up before a light which is of sufficient intensity to enable one to distinguish all parts clearly. The normal tooth appears as a white, clearly defined structure with a fine white, unbroken marginal line, called the peridental lamella. The bony structure of the jaw which supports the tooth is a mottled dark gray in color. However, if one examines a tooth which has a "hidden" abscess at its apex, a dark shadow will be seen just below the tooth and the thin white marginal line (peridental lamella) will have had its continuity destroyed. This means that at the apex of the tooth there has been a destruction of the bony structure chiefly through the agency of bacteria, and that infection is present. Often, as has been stated, such infections are not only hidden to the naked eye but may even cause no pain, so that without the X-ray picture they would remain undiscovered. The danger from such infections lies precisely in the fact that they are painless. Not infrequently the dentist is accused of causing pain by his manifold tortures in an apparently innocent tooth, but pain is not the most important criterion of infection, nor is infection harmless because it is not painful.

According to the widespread belief in the doctrine of "focal" infection, the presence of infection, no matter how minute and how painless, in any part of the body may be disseminated to other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parts of the body and start other infections which result in serious systemic disorders. Thus, it is believed the blood or lymph may carry infection to comparatively remote points. For example, a hidden painless tooth abcess such as has been described may be responsible for kidney diseases of which pyelitis is one of the common forms. The Mayo clinic at Rochester, Minnesota, which holds the foremost place in American medicine, has conducted most of the scientific research upon which this doctrine is based. However, universal acceptance of these tenets is still lacking and there is a sound basis for the feeling that the dangers of focal infection have been greatly exaggerated particularly in its broader applications. The removal of infected teeth can never prove to be a cure-all for every type of clinical condition any more than the daily repetition of a Pollyannaish phrase will cure infected teeth. Furthermore, extraction is not the sole method of dealing with infected teeth. The more conservative dentist may consider it preferable to treat the tooth rather than operate.

Oral diagnosis has come to depend largely on the X-ray. It is, however, as much a mistake to exaggerate as it is to underestimate its importance. Of late a number of members of the dental profession have come to place too much reliance on the work of X-ray laboratories. Not that such work fails to be competent, but rather that the laboratories tend more and more to arrogate to themselves the function of diagnosis. It is but a poor diagnosis which depends solely on the X-ray picture and does not take into consideration the actual condition of the tooth in situ. While it is true that specialization in X-ray work has brought about a high degree of technical perfection, nevertheless the proper interpretation of such findings is essentially based on all the science and experience that dentistry commands and in consequence should be rendered only by the dentist himself. The same criticism applies to laboratory diagnosis based on other X-ray findings, particularly in the lungs. Obviously the physician who has specialized in tuberculosis is the only one capable of attaining an adequate perspective on all the facts in the case. The proper place of the X-ray in dentistry and medicine is as an *aid* to diagnosis along with the clinical examination of the organ under consideration, the patient's general condition, etc.

Nor is the X-ray employed solely for the identification of the myriad disturbances which make life painful. It is also used as a means of treating many internal conditions, as well as external growths. Cancer, a disease which causes a high mortality in mature adults, can best be treated in certain of its forms by the X-ray. Recently there was considerable publicity given to a controversy among some of the foremost surgeons with regard to the value of X-ray and radium in the treatment of cancer. Whatever may be the disagreement concerning the comparative values of surgery and the X-ray for internal cancer, the medical profession in general advocates the treatment of skin cancer by the proper dosage of X-ray or radium.

We have now, in the United States, at Columbia and Harvard Universities two of the most powerful X-ray machines ever built, which are being used chiefly for further experimentation along these lines. The X-ray has opened up manifold possibilities in all branches of medicine as well as in other fields. In fact it has often been likened to the invention of the microscope which brought to us the vision of a world too minute for the naked eye to penetrate. Perhaps one of the most ingenious uses to which the X-ray has been put is the determination of the ripening of cheese. Swiss cheese, particularly, when made on a large scale can be examined without disturbing the contents of containers regardless of size by merely X-raying from time to time until the holes are numerous and of sufficient diameter. This removes the necessity of frequent sampling which represents a great loss of time and material. As an instrument of detection the X-ray is also used in differentiating genuine from spurious paintings by old masters. The paints by virtue of the metals present resist penetration of the rays in a characteristic manner.

The chapter dealing with the martyrs to X-ray research has yet to be written. The X-ray is powerful in its intensity. This is readily appreciated when it is remembered that in two seconds the rays have penetrated the jaw bone sufficiently to yield a picture of the teeth. It is only in recent years that investigators working continuously with the X-ray have realized how dangerous may be the burns resulting from its use when the operator is not sufficiently protected. Dr. Infroit, the X-ray pioneer of the Salpetrière in Paris and one of the most prominent radiologists of the last decade, underwent twenty-four operations as a result of injuries sustained in research work. Very thick sheets of lead might have saved him from further injury after he first learned of the potency of the rays, but he refused to protect himself thus as it interfered with the delicacy of his work. Recently news of his death reached this country. Bonnet and Vaillant in France, Pujol in Spain and others who were also pioneers in X-ray treatment in their respective countries have sacrificed first their arms, then their legs and finally their lives to make the X-ray safe for humanity.

Frequently in X-ray work patients have been burned because of inadequate knowledge or a combination of enthusiasm with a false sense of security on the part of the manipulator. It is a fact, however, that X-ray is absolutely harmless when properly used. Examinations can be made without the slightest injury to the patient and the operator can protect himself completely against its continuous and insidious evil influence. Most burns are produced by the use of greater ray penetration than is necessary. In order to avoid burns to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

patients the following precautions are employed. As small a quantity and penetration of rays as is consistent with the examination are employed, and the time is shortened as much as possible. Intensifying screens and filters for the elimination of the softer rays are used, while the rays are confined to the area actually under observation. The operator avoids burns by keeping out of the field of the rays, by interposing lead screens, and by the use of lead lined gloves, shields, aprons and masks. Like electricity this force is harnessed by man to do his will, but like electricity it exacts the penalty of death. Leray, one of the most distinguished French Légionnaires in radiology, has called the X-ray: the hidden god who does not wish to give up his secrets and who strikes down men who seek to take them.

NICHOLAS AND LILLIAN KOPELOFF.

The Crimes of Law Enforcement

All the crimes committed by all the criminals do not equal those committed by our law-enforcing officials.

THE above words were recently uttered by an able lawyer in a mid-western capital city. He was referring specifically to the disregard by police authorities of constitutional provisions and statutory laws designed to protect the citizens' liberty and property from undue interference and danger.

That this disregard by law-enforcing agencies of legal restraints has grown measurably with the effort to enforce prohibition is apparent in every city in the land, and the more the machinery of law enforcement has broken down in its apparently hopeless task, the more have the old safeguards of individual rights been thrown to the winds. Homes and places of business are invaded by officers without search warrants or with warrants improperly issued and served. Property is seized or destroyed without warrant of law. Persons are assaulted on the barest suspicion of guilt or are arrested and booked at police headquarters for "investigation"—a charge for which there exists no lawful authority. Often they are held for days —even weeks—under this legal fiction, only to be released because nothing can be found against them. The police "drag net," which Mr. Palmer's "red raids" made notorious, is familiar to the residents of every city, when, following some sensational crime, dozens are sometimes held in jail for a crime of which only one or two could possibly have been guilty. In many instances police courts cooperate with police officers in these violations of human rights guaranteed by law. Bail is refused or fixed excessively high, with the consequent inability of suspects to obtain their liberty as contemplated by law, or the undue enrichment of professional bond sharks who haunt every police station. Suspects are held incommunicado from relatives and lawyers. The "third degree" is familiar to all.

Now it may be that the framers of our state constitutions and laws have gone too far in protecting the rights of the individual citizen. It may be better that many innocent people suffer than that one guilty person escape. But that is not the theory or provision of our criminal code, whose abuse by public officials breeds increasing disrespect for law in this most lawless of countries.

One great trouble is that you and I, Mr. and Mrs. Respectability, figure that such things can never injure us—that those who suffer as a rule from such police methods deserve some punishment on general principle as persons of evil repute. Such a view is a mistake. One can never afford to be wholly disregardful of the violations of another's rights.

Nor by any means are all the violations of human rights confined to those suspected of the illegal sale of liquor. Often they involve far more serious crimes. Not long ago a prominent lawyer in a state metropolis received a call from a fellow citizen—a good, substantial man of no special prominence. The caller had just received a note from his brother, a commercial traveler living in another state, saying that he had been held in jail for some days without being informed of the charges against him or able to get word to any one. He had sent the note by a fellow prisoner who had just been released after a short sentence for vagrancy. On receiving the note the brother had gone to the jail but had been denied communication with the prisoner who was booked for "investigation." The lawyer, being a man of influence and legal standing, had but little trouble in seeing the prisoner. The latter had represented a good business firm for years. All that he knew about the affair was that as he was walking from the train on which he had arrived to his hotel two plain clothes men had arrested him. All information as to the charges against him were denied him and he was put in a cell. Two days later he was confronted by a woman and a little girl and the latter was asked if he was the man, whereupon she nodded her head in the affirmative.

The lawyer demanded that the police file charges. This they first refused to do but when he went to get a writ of habeas corpus they filed charges of a most heinous crime, the date of whose commission was definitely fixed. The lawyer repaired to his client's cell again and the accused said that he could prove, by carbon copies of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orders in his order-book which the police had taken from him, that he was calling on customers in a distant state for days before and after the date of the crime. His lawyer secured the book and requested the state's attorney to wire to the customers shown by it to have been placing orders for several days each side of the date when the crime was committed. This was done and in every case they replied by wire that the salesman had been there and taken their orders just as his records showed. The prisoner was then released.

What recourse had he? Theoretically a suit for false arrest against the officers, with all the attendant newspaper notoriety over a most disgraceful charge. Practically he had none. Familiarity with police practices convinces me that similar outrages are sufficiently frequent in every city to demand serious concern by every one of us. Here was a case of a man of sufficient means and influence, who—if the law had been followed by filing charges, taking him before the nearest magistrate and having bond fixed—would have had no difficulty in securing prompt justice. But the situation of the humbler yet equally innocent victim of such methods is far more difficult.

What is the answer? For one thing, there ought to be a public attorney at every police court representing not the prosecution but the defence, whose duty it should be to see that the rights of every accused person—even of criminals—are fully protected under the law and that such outrages as holding persons for any considerable period for investigation, without filing charges and fixing bail, are stopped. It would be well also if public safety heads or civil service commissions would see that police are given instruction by some competent lawyer in the rights of citizens under the law.

Furthermore, since the state cannot be sued, except by its own consent, and the average police officer is not financially responsible for his malfeasances, it would be well to compel cities to waive this immunity by state laws making them liable to damages because of aggravated wrongs committed by their police officers or else to provide that patrolmen and detectives must furnish bonds for injuries to private citizens through illegal acts.

Of course the police have some justification. In most cases it is through overzealousness rather than sheer brutality, indifference or a desire to inflict unjust punishment that bills of rights and statutes are ignored. They say that it is impossible for them to catch criminals and check crime by following the law literally; that if they cannot hold suspects for investigation, guilty parties will secure their liberty on bail, escape, frame up their defence, etc. Then the public finds fault with the authorities for failing to function efficiently in the solution of crime and the detection of criminals. There's something in that argument, too. The only thing against it is that the law which they have sworn to enforce holds differently and that to a considerable extent American criminal law is based on the theory that it is better that several guilty escape than that one innocent person suffer.

Yet the disregard of law by enforcement officials has been increasing alarmingly in recent months in an effort to prevent the illegal sale of alcoholic liquors. For example: in most states statutes require that search warrants be issued only after complaining witnesses swear that they have good reason to believe that the law is being violated in the specific case involved and after they have been carefully examined by the issuing judge; that such warrants shall not, except in emergencies, be served at night; and that before search of any premises is made the warrant shall be read to the party named in it. The purpose of these provisions is of course to prevent the use of fake warrants by crooks to gain easy access to premises.

But, say prohibition enforcing officers, to follow these requirements would make the prevention of bootlegging all but impossible. If the complaining witness must sign and swear to such warrants, after careful examination by the court, it knocks out the "stool pigeon," for he would immediately become known and "spotted" by liquor sellers. If officers must serve warrants in daylight, warning of their approach is made much more easy. And if a warrant must be ready before search is made, ample time is given for the destruction of evidence.

Said a police official to me the other day, after I had alternately criticized him for laxity in checking bootlegging and for legal outrages committed by his men: "There are at least one hundred bootlegging places in 'temp' bars, cigar and drug stores within a few blocks of this room, not to mention others scattered all over town. Most of them have a small amount behind partitions with latched gates, or in back rooms with locked doors. If I have to stop to read a search warrant the liquor is dumped down the sink and all the evidence is gone by the time my men can begin their search. It's almost impossible to catch them replenishing their supplies. If I were to stop and search every person going in or out of a 'temp' bar, cigar or drug store, you'd be after me again for violating individual rights. It simply can't be done if we follow the law." At a recent convention of chiefs of police I talked with many high police officials and all told this same story.

The result is that raiding squads are sent out at night in suspected districts with scores of John Doe search warrants improperly issued and improperly served. They rush into homes and business places, smashing down barriers without reading their warrants and beating up proprietors and attendants either to prevent their "dumping" evidence or as a warning never to try it—all as wholly illegal as the crime they are attempting to check.

All that I can reply to the claim of enforcement officers that these illegal methods are necessary if prohibition is even approximately to be enforced,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is that the framers of prohibitory amendments might well have considered these facts in advance, and that nothing breeds disrespect for all law so much as its violation by those charged with upholding it.

Already many courts are growing tired of winking at such violations of fundamental rights and are making it more and more difficult to enforce prohibition. I know of one corporation lawyer who began defending cases charged with violation of the prohibition laws simply to educate police officers in law observance. He takes no bootlegging cases, save those where he thinks the law enforcing officers have themselves violated the law. In the past few months he has had over seventy cases of persons unquestionably guilty of having violated the liquor laws—but not a single one of them has ever gotten to a jury.

Here is a typical example. A raiding squad, armed with a search warrant for gambling devices, went to a residence of doubtful repute. They found no gambling devices, but did find some barrels of mash, which they destroyed—a wholly illegal proceeding, as the law does not make a policeman also judge, jury and executioner. They also secured a considerable amount of liquor, unquestionably kept for illegal sale. This they loaded in their wagon and took to the station to be used as evidence against the owner. The attorney for the accused raised the question that the liquor had been illegally seized under a gambling search warrant, and the court ordered the return of the evidence to the owner. The police then swore out a liquor search warrant, hauled the evidence back to the owner, unloaded it in his yard, read him the liquor search warrant, loaded it back into the wagon and arrested the owner. Then the defendant's attorney raised the point that when they got out the search warrant they had to swear that they believed the liquor to be in his client's possession at the time, whereas it was in their own possession at the police station. The police escaped with a reprimand from the bench and were lucky to get off without a citation for contempt for evading the court's former orders.

Despairing of accomplishing anything in this case in the state courts, the police offered to furnish evidence to the federal authorities for prosecution under federal statutes. This has been a common custom where convictions could not be secured in state courts. The attorney for the defence informally raised the question as to whether his client could be tried in the federal court on evidence illegally obtained for the state courts. When the federal judge indicated that he would so hold, the district attorney dismissed seventy-five similar cases then pending, saying it would be useless to try them under such conditions.

The local federal prohibition officers threw up their hands in despair. "There's no use," they said, "in trying to enforce the law under such circumstances. There is no reason to think we can be more successful by using different methods than the city police and anyway we can't maintain a sufficient force of federal officers here to cope with the situation. We've got to depend for help on evidence secured by the city police in whatever way they can get it or else admit our inability to deal with bootlegging effectively."

Another federal judge went even further. Deputy United States marshals seized without warrant the grips of two men whom they suspected were illegally transporting liquor, broke them open and found them filled with half-pint bottles of whisky. An attorney raised the question of the competency of the evidence thus illegally procured and the judge sustained him. "But, your honor," protested the United States Attorney, "if you're going to hold that way I can't enforce this law." The Judge spoke sharply. "I am no more interested," he said, "in helping you enforce any particular law than I am in protecting citizens in their rights under the Constitution; and if you bring any more cases into this court based on evidence secured in a similar illegal manner, some one is going to be punished for contempt." And that was that!

What to do? What to do? That's the question which is agitating the minds of law enforcing officials these days, caught by the dilemma of either becoming law violators themselves or of being criticized for inefficiency and laxity in law enforcement. It's a tough problem—another case of being damned if you do and damned if you don't. I have no wisdom to offer, save to suggest that until the time shall come when popular and legislative sentiment will see fit to abandon the fundamental principles of individual liberty laid down by the fathers of the commonwealth, we shall do well to go slow on sumptuary legislation or else be willing to see it made a joke of by the impossibility of effective enforcement. And of the two I suspect the latter is the greater evil.

AUSTIN HAINES.

Three Things

Three things filled this day for me,
Three common things filled this day;
Each had, for me, a word to say;
Said it in beauty, and was done:
Cows on a hillside all one way,
A buttercup tilted seductively,
And a lark arguing with the sun.

These three things, merely these three,
Were enough to cry the world
Out of my heart: the buttercup curled
Where some gorgeous ruffian plundered;
The skylark's dizzy flag unfurled;
The placid cows pensively
Wondering why they wondered.

JOSEPH AUSLANDER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Goya

THE recent death of Aureliano de Beruete y Moret has deprived the Prado Museum of its most distinguished director and the art world of a competent and scholarly critic. De Beruete's work on Goya, the first volume of which has just been published in English (Goya As A Portrait Painter: The Houghton Mifflin Company. $15.00), is a study of comprehensive proportions, a systematic correlation of the artist's unparalleled versatility with the vicissitudes of a long career extending from the days of gay and easy prosperity to the final shame and exile. With a magnificent array of concisely ordered facts, De Beruete tears the legendary Goya to pieces. It seems uncharitable for a Castilian critic to strip his hero of the romantic brutalities which are esteemed as essentially Spanish, but in this particular case it is a signal achievement. The brilliant picaroon against whose insatiable lust no convent was safe; the companion of imperial putas; the fearless swordsman and bull-fighter; in fact the great Goya of popular fame, is reduced to a fiercely morose personage much more quarrelsome than picturesque. I find, for instance, that he was not precocious; that he did nothing of importance until his thirty-seventh year; that the Duchess of Alba was not the original of the celebrated majas; that his intrigues with the said Duchess, if they occurred at all, must have taken place when the painter was nearly fifty-five years of age, stone deaf and in bad health; that his life was, on the whole, a long struggle to find adequate expression for his extraordinary artistic impulses. De Beruete has cleared the ground of romantic trumpery, thereby making it easier to proceed from the spurious appeal of subject-matter to the consideration of fundamental aesthetic values.

Goya stands out boldly in the history of art, an uncompromising, isolated figure in a land which has produced few artists of the first rank. When he appeared, Spain was spiritually as sterile as the United States of the present time; there was no background of appreciation, no tradition, no genuine religious conviction—nothing but poverty, both mental and physical, and the contemptible imitation of French frivolity. Art was practically dead. Since Velazquez there had not been a name worth mentioning; the court painters were nondescript Flemings and second-rate disciples of the Fragonard lineage. It takes a giant to shoulder the spiritual burdens of a nation in transitional periods of barrenness—Rembrandt is the solitary case in point—and Goya, for all his energy and his power, was no giant. Of all artists of eminence he was the least affected by the classical tradition: he cared little for the Italian Renaissance and less for the Greeks, and adrift in a desolate age, he turned to the portrait and the grotesque. His fight against conventionality was long and horrific; he began with a series of undistinguished cartoons for tapestries, studied Rembrandt, but lacking the profounder creative vision of the great masters, he fell back on lesser masters whom he could understand—on Velazquez particularly, and on nature. Henceforward his work became original and prolific but increasingly literal: he subordinated constructive modelling to the deadly transcription of natural values, enforced the theatrical side of his talent, and relied on the purely physical aspects of life to attain startling effects. His art, when carried into France, was responsible for a long line of pseudo-realists, unimaginative men who dragged photography into painting, who debased art into a stupid mechanical pastime, who cultivated the pretty face and the play of textures—in short, who converted the noble business of painting into a pernicious portraiture which only the genius of Cézanne could overthrow.

Much has been written of Goya's honesty and equally as much of his realism. His candor was often cruel and insulting, and his satirical etchings daring to the point of heresy, but in fundamental artistic integrity he was not more remarkable than other painters of ability. He had all the pride of a peasant in his position as court painter, and was enough of the sycophant to weather the Bonaparte fiasco and to hold his job again under Ferdinand. It may have demanded considerable moral courage to delineate Charles IV and his family as they actually were, a group of ugly degenerates, but audacious fidelity to the model is no criterion of aesthetic beauty. Goya, on the other hand, was not blind to natural charm, and rendered it strikingly if his sitter happened to be attractive: witness the Bookseller of Calle de Carretas, Doña Isabel Corbo de Porcel, and the recognizable likenesses of the comely strumpets whom he apotheosized in the frescoes of San Antonio de la Florida. Herein lies the secret of his limitations. Unmoved by the higher forces of the spirit, he became absorbed in technical processes and subservient to naturalistic accuracy. Mere love of nature has never produced great pictures. The true life of art—its plastic animation, its coherent activity, its imaginative structure—is directly referable to an irresistible stimulus which may be traced through the lawless details of experience to a philosophic contemplation of the meaning of life itself. In Michael Angelo, Giotto, El Greco and in Cézanne, one is never conscious of the superficial quality known as the physically beautiful. With these men the model was only a means, a framework, I might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say, to support a single organic totality, one form indissoluble and satisfying, the concrete existence of all that the soul in its inmost recesses has had power to experience and to create. There is in a small piece of drapery by El Greco more enduring vitality, more actual movement and beauty, than in the most ambitious canvas of the Aragonese painter, despite his dexterity and brilliance.

Goya inclined to the sensational; instead of employing the model as a motif for creation, he depended too liberally on scenic characteristics; he captures the pictorial interest through a curiously personal reduplication of natural values. Rarely could he free himself from the tyranny of the picturesque. One has only to compare his portraits with those of Rembrandt to see the difference between the dazzling arrangements of natural light and shade, and the synthesis of pure form, thick, material and plastic. His flexible art marks the beginning of the modern decadence; it led to imitation rather than to construction, and ultimately to the academic delineation of surfaces. To make his work graphic he devoted himself to the appearances of objects and to their intricate details; and his drawing, spontaneous and admirable as it usually was, became, in consequence, descriptive and methodical. He seldom escaped the model; he accepted nature completely after the manner of the camera, translated the lights and darks into an equivalent scale of extremely subtle and effective grays, and introduced color for decorative purposes. It would be grossly unfair to say that he was wholly a literalist: his simplified drawing was powerful and distinguished, and he was generally successful in his arbitrary eliminations, but in the strictest sense of the word he was not a composer at all. He was constantly preoccupied in a photographic way with externals, with the particularities of objects; and his imagination, vivid within a limited scope, was busy with secondary matters. With the true composer, design is the accompaniment of art and not art itself—he alters the actual position of objects in space to meet the demands of his conception; he studies shapes and forms and colors, and creates a new beauty by means of new combinations. Goya's best designs are to be found in his engravings and etchings, but in two or three of his oils he rose to the heights. His Self-Portrait: 1815, is worthy of Rembrandt, and his Portrait of Conde de Fernán Núñez is composing of an exalted order.

The realism of Goya had been loosely interpreted and falsely commended. To my knowledge not a single critic has been able to mention Los Caprichos or Tauromachia without exclaiming, "In these works the artist has mirrored the very soul of Spain!" Goya's predilection for the horrible, the naked and the obscene is certainly to be preferred to the sentimentality which beslubbers most etchings, but after all, these elements have nothing to do with plastic reality, the truth born of the perfect relation of the constituent parts. Hegel made this plain long ago when he said, "Nothing is genuinely real but that which is actual in its own right, the substance of nature and of mind, fixing in itself a definite existence, retaining an essential and self-centred being, thus and thus only attaining genuine reality." To mirror the soul of Spain through black-and-white satire is not, in itself, an aesthetic accomplishment. It is possible, of course, for an artist to express himself satirically, but we cannot on that account afford to overlook the drawing behind the document. Goya stressed his engravings with the trenchant accent of illustrative brutality; as he advanced in years he grew more and more infatuated with hideously representative subject-matter, and in the end, in his own words, "the dream of reason produced monsters." At times, and they are too numerous to be accidental, the monsters arrive at the beauty inherent in the reality of all art; the sinister appeal of subject-matter is submerged in a superb massing of black-and-white areas. In these examples the design is strangely oriental, and it is more than likely that Goya was influenced by the Sassanian decorations of old Spain.

Goya is the main source of modern naturalism. He was introduced to the French by Manet, who went to Madrid to study Velazquez, discovered Goya, and returned home with a new master to exploit. Manet was more literal than the Spaniard; he looked upon painting as a craft, and his sincere, highly finished but unimaginative work hastened the decline of art from an expressive scheme of life to a technical process. Next Whistler, whose close adherence to natural values is half-hidden beneath a dilute, eclectic charm; then Sargent, a virtuoso with a gift for superficial likenesses; and Zuloaga, a thin, illustrative decorator. After Sargent the deluge! The abominable onrush of cheap portraits displayed perennially in the fashionable salons of Paris and the galleries of Fifth Avenue! Impressionism, a collateral movement, was only technically radical. Disregarding individual deviations, the aim of this school was the intensification of tone, a novel and absorbing investigation of light, a playful mechanics which became so minute and concentrated as to destroy all creative activity. It remained for Cézanne, a painter with a vision, to stem the tide, and to turn art back to the consideration of design. Cézanne was conscious of the compelling nature of clearly conceived and clearly presented form and of the imperative need for a sequence between forms. He aroused the modern mind to the significance of the far past, to the profound study of the geometric formation of cubic structure, and to the reality embodied in great art. His was the first logical move toward increasing the freedom and force of art since the Renaissance.

THOMAS CRAVEN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It Is the Lark

Romeo and Juliet. Henry Miller's Theatre. January 24, 1923.

IF you talk of whether a theatrical performance—or the design for a production—is great or not, you might very well be expected to suggest at least what the word *great* in such a case implies. In the performance of Romeo and Juliet, then, the achievement will be great in so far as it is inclusive, in so far as there are lines in it that draw from large spaces of living and run on from the single occasion into those spaces again, in so far as there is brought to bear on this single instance the light of a wider human living and truth. In the balcony scene, to take an example, besides the technical ability to recite the verses, we should have the idea of youth, the access of passionate love, the eager calling one another back to speak of love again, the romantic and wistful poetry of the moment, the point that lies beneath the verse and its ornament and elaboration; these are necessary qualities before the performance of the scene gets anywhere to speak of at all. And then it would approach being great in so far as there appears beneath all these necessary qualities a sense of the depth of all life and passion, of what it means to have this moment pass, of the shadow that lies around this flame. Greatness here will imply a recognition of the fact that at such a moment we hear the rumor of the blood in the veins, that we look to no reality outside of human life, which becomes incandescent, complete in itself. In so complete a moment of living there exists a harmony with all natural things, the human thing becomes like light and trees; and that is why the speeches of lovers show how they feel themselves one with the place, the hour and the season; and why the lovers' thoughts and their pretty images turn so frequently on the stars, the moon, the birds and the dawn. In the last act of Romeo and Juliet the necessary details for the actors will as a matter of course include a grasp of the idea of young grief and hot impulse, of the romantic expenditure of life, the pathetic story of lovers. But greatness in this scene will only come as there appears in it something about life and time that spreads beyond the single moment or the disaster that befalls these two particular persons; something that is not only pitiful but tragic; that conveys the surprise of truth and the happiness of it, however bitter it may be; something that, after the scene ends and the curtain is down, remains and fills the mind, as the mind is filled—though strangely, with a kind of luminous abstraction—after music has been played.

How far Shakespeare himself achieved all this range and truth might be debated, Romeo and Juliet is an early play. But it seems to me undeniable, as I listen to the lines, that, though the young dramatist is yet full of the ornate manner of his epoch and is sometimes overheavy and diverted with sixteenth century surface detail, the emotion underlying the progression of the scenes is absolutely secure and true.

The performance of Romeo and Juliet at Henry Miller's Theatre could not be called great. But we have no particular right to demand greatness every time Shakespeare is tried, if we get greatness once in a century we may thank our lucky stars. Nor need we pick the bones of actors merely because they venture into Shakespeare when otherwise in lighter efforts we let them off so easily. But, great or no, this new Romeo and Juliet is a performance full of fresh and persuasive life.

The production, so far as settings go, is not well lighted for the most part, and lacks on the whole a single stamp of invention or idea. Capulet's House is the worst, with an unfortunate shallowness and an inexcusably lean and trivial central doorway. Juliet's chamber with its purple and red; the fine yellow wall in Mantua, and the shadowy crypt with its effective stair, are better.

The ensembles generally are only indifferent good; the part of the page, of the parents and friends and cousins, are more or less fair, the nurse tart, so so. Mercutio, that indestructibly happy part, comes off agreeably, if a little thinly, at Mr. Dennis King's hands, who nevertheless here, as in the Milne play at the Garrick, has a touch of poetry worth watching. Mr. Rollo Peters has made a good start with Romeo; and Romeo, when everything is said, is one of the most troublesome parts in our theatre, so closely does he skirt on being a mere fool of a lover, a romantic blunderer reciting his head off. Romeo, I think, has to be imagined as a human vessel through which pours the passion of love, as the wind comes out of space and blows through the boughs of a tree; he has to be seen as an extravagant abundance and excess; he has to be seen as a piece of young life identical with the violent beauty and heat of living. Mr. Peters is not always flexible yet and not by any means secure or even in his performance, but his idea is excellent. In the Mantua scene, to take examples, where the news comes of Juliet's death, he has the verse, the pose, rather than the bottom of the tragic moment; in the balcony scene he reads the very difficult and elaborate lines beautifully, with genuine poetic understanding and a fine variety and precision of cadence and a deep emotional naturalness beneath the intricate surface of Shakespeare's words.

Miss Cowl's Juliet is beautiful, first of all, to see, a child, a tragic girl, a woman convincing to the eye as few Juliets ever had the good fortune to be. She has quiet too and naturalness and a right simplicity of method. Her readings are often, as in the speech about waking among her great kinsmen's bones and plucking the mangled Tybalt from his shroud, quite traditional—which is nothing against them—but well studied and made her very own. Her weakest spots are toward the first of the play, those with the nurse especially, where more poetic transmutation must be wrought and more of the beautiful necessity discovered. What time and study and thought may do to extend into the deeper beauty, and into more of that kind of impalpable distinction, that would make Miss Cowl's performance a great one, remains to be seen. But at present her Juliet manages to avoid entirely any intrusion of actor egotism or trivial novelty; the conception behind it appears to be flexible and eager and gentle; within its present range it is a lovely and sincere beginning.

The whole occasion of this Romeo and Juliet in fact seems to have a bright and pitiful and happy and young life shattering down upon it. The players are mostly not very tall personages, Juliet, Mercutio, Romeo, they all look fresh and slight and alive with something going on in them that is their own, a romance of youth and energy that might induce you to forgive them much more than there is to forgive. In sum—unless you ponder longer on the depth of meaning that Shakespeare wrought into his golden scenes—you could well believe that there on the stage were young people who had written their play for themselves.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

The Barbour Roosevelt Sequoia Park Bill

SIR: The defence of the Barbour bill (H.R. 7452), which takes away half the Sequoia National Park, that Acting Forester E. A. Sherman, of the U. S. Forest Service (a bureau of the Department of Agriculture) makes in the New Republic for February 7th, evades and ignores the questions at issue.

Why cannot the park be enlarged without giving up half the present park to the Forest Service? Why should we not keep our National Parks instead of setting the precedent of giving them up piece by piece for commercial and political exploitation? And why, if there is any reason for doing so, is it not done openly instead of by a secret agreement between bureau chiefs and well concealed jokers in a bill entitled "An act to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park"? These are the questions that the public would like to have the Department of Agriculture answer. Why has it omitted answering them in its official defence of the bill? May this not lead the public to conclude that it cannot answer them, at least not with any reasons that it can venture to share with the public?

A considerable part of Mr. Sherman's defence is taken up in maintaining that the demand for giving up the three southern townships (nearly one half of the park) was not inspired or initiated by the Forest Service. Who then is demanding it? Let the reader ask himself who is going to get these three townships and this magnificent pine timber? And is it a Forest Service or a Park Service official who rushes into the breach to defend the bill when it is criticized? As Mr. Sherman mentions the National Parks Association (an organization with headquarters at Washington and in close touch with the government bureaus) as endorsing the bill, he will surely not object to my quoting from a letter from the Secretary of that association, dated December 21, 1921:

> The boundaries of the proposed Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park represent the final compromise of four or five years of struggle between the National Park Service and the Forest Service. I call it a compromise for politeness' sake; the National Park Service in the end merely accepted the last boundary demanded by the Forest Service because it feared that, if it went on struggling, Forest Service demands would become still more strenuous. . . . Not very many individuals besides you and me appear even to have noticed the incidental loss of half of Sequoia National Park.

If the U. S. Forest Service is representing the interests of the public by whom it is maintained and whom it should be serving, why is it demanding that the public "compromise" with it?

In so far as the bill adds land to the park it is all right, but it would be hard to find anywhere in the United States many acres of equal extent that are of less commercial value than that which the Barbour bill adds. It is more than half bare rock. Except in the case of a very few small tracts, the land where forested at all, has only a growth of small, stunted or inferior trees. Even the open lands adapted for grazing are so limited and so inaccessible that they bring but little rental. Let me allow the Chief of the Forest Service to describe the Sequoia Park (not merely the added area) as it will be when the Barbour bill has passed.

> The map which you see before you represents the boundaries as they have resulted from some three or four years of study and adjustment on both sides. In adjusting those boundaries the most important areas of commercial timber have been eliminated from the proposed addition. Aside from the giant forests, the areas of commercial timber remaining within the area are of negligible extent and of negligible future importance to the forest industries of California. We have also eliminated from the boundary an extensive mineral development near Mineral King.
>
> We have eliminated from the boundaries of the proposed park the principal areas where existing use of the range would be disrupted, to the injury of the local live-stock interests. (*Extract of speech by Col. W. B. Greeley, Chief Forester, U. S. Forest Service, before the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives at the hearing on the Barbour bill, December* 13, 1921).

Truly a fine National Park, from the point of view of the Forest Service! Little or nothing in it that that bureau can use, *for public opinion will not permit it to sell sequoia trees*, which cover only a few hundred acres all told! Does the public want our National Parks trimmed down and their boundaries juggled until they conform to the test of being entirely valueless?

New York City. WILLARD G. VAN NAME.

Germany's Counter-Proposals

SIR: I should like answers to the following questions: What offers of payment of reparations has the German government made as counter-proposals to the various ultimata from the Reparations Commission and the Conferences of Premiers? What were the dates of these offers? For what amounts were they written? On what pretexts were they refused and by whom?

This information would help me greatly in my efforts to persuade some of my conservative friends to look at the war after the war sanely. J. P. FERRIS.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

[A counter-proposal to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles was made by Germany on May 29, 1919, offering a payment of 20 billion marks gold by 1926, and annual payments from 1927 onward to an amount not in excess of 100 billion marks gold without interest. Because France was unwilling to accept a definite sum before she had investigated her losses, the Council of Four declined the offer and the fixing of the indemnity was left to the Reparations Commission.

The Paris Proposal of the Reparations Commission involved a total amount of 226 billion marks gold and 12 percent of Germany's exports, to be paid over a period of 42 years. Germany's counter-proposal, presented by Dr. Simons to the Supreme Council at the London Conference, March 1, 1921, offered a total payment of 50 billion marks gold (which Dr. Simons regarded as the discounting of the Paris Proposal amount at 8 percent.) From this amount 20 billions of reparations already paid were to be deducted. Of the remainder, 8 billions were to be covered by an international loan exempt from income tax, and the balance to be undertaken by Germany herself. The annuity under this plan was not to exceed a billion marks.

The Supreme Council, through Lloyd George, replied that the Allies could not discuss this as an alternative to the Paris Proposal because it ignored the export annuities, discounted the amount arbitrarily at 8 percent, made a deduction of 20 billions for payments which the Reparations Commission had assessed at less than half that sum, limited the interest to 5 percent, and by allowing no income tax on the international loan securities, placed the burden on the country of issue. Germany was given four days to make a new offer or suffer military penalties. Whereupon Germany agreed to accept the terms of the Paris Proposal for five years, meeting the required annuities of three billion marks gold till 1926 at which time, after the plebiscite in Silesia, the terms were to be readjusted. This proposal was refused by the London Conference because it covered a period of only five years, during which time Germany, by paying out of loans instead of current revenue, said Lloyd George, could actually force the rest of the world to pay her reparations debts.

Following an Allied ultimatum demanding the transfer of the gold payment for reparations due May 1, 1921, Germany made a new offer (April 24, 1921) through the United States of a payment of 50 billion marks gold with accrued interest at 4 percent to an ultimate total of 200 billion. After consultation with France, who refused the offer as being in fact only half the total of the Paris Accord, Secretary Hughes reported that the offer was unacceptable to the Allies and suggested that Germany submit new terms direct.

The London Conference, May 6, 1921, issued a six-day ultimatum requiring Germany to pay, in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles:

> 132 billion marks less reparations already paid. To be secured by a bond series of
>
> A) 12 billion marks gold, issued July 1, 1921, with interest at 5 percent and a 1 percent sinking fund retroactive to May 1, 1921.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

B) 38 billion marks gold, November 1, 1921.

C) 82 billion marks gold to be turned over to the Reparations Commission on November 1, 1921, and to be issued by them when Germany proved able to carry the interest and sinking fund. Until the redemption of the Class C Bonds Germany was required to pay yearly 2 billion marks gold and 26 percent of the value of her exports. Any surplus over this amount was to be used to pay interest at 2½ percent from May 1921 to 1926 on the bonds in the hands of the Reparations Commission and not yet issued.

This ultimatum was accepted.—THE EDITORS.]

Making Statistics Lie

SIR: In the Literary Digest of January 6th appeared an article entitled The Root of the Reparation Difficulty. It was written by the editor himself as the result of a trip to Paris and purports to be "of the most authoritative character obtainable." It represents at least the most authoritative statement by the periodical which in America combines the largest circulation with the greatest appearance of impartiality concerning "a situation fraught with incalculable menace to Europe and to the world." The article is carefully written and bristles with statistics obtained from French authorities, which are used to show that France has been put to great expense in repairing the damage wrought by Germany and that "if Germany does not pay, some one else must." While it is written from the French point of view and fails utterly to consider the deeper seated difficulty which has made it impossible for Germany to pay, the argument is logical and seems fair. But the article is illustrated with maps and diagrams and pictures which are intended chiefly to show the immense damage wrought by the Germans. It was these that I noticed particularly when I first saw the article and it is these which most readers will remember, even if they have taken the trouble to read the text itself. I wish therefore to call attention to certain discoveries which I have made concerning these illustrations.

On page 9 is a diagram which represents the relative amount of destruction and restoration of buildings. In the foreground are three little buildings which represent the total number of buildings restored from the time of the armistice until the three dates of January 1, 1921, January 1, 1922, and September 1, 1922. Behind these looms up an immense building which covers just four times as much paper as the building which represents the total number of buildings restored on September 1, 1922. This immense building is labelled "What remains to do." I am greatly impressed. Indeed France has suffered even more than I had realized! Then I notice the figures which accompany the diagram. I discover first that instead of representing *what remains to be done* the large building represents the *grand total of buildings destroyed!* Then I make a further discovery. The grand total of buildings destroyed instead of being five times as great as the number replaced is actually only 50 percent in excess of replacements and the French have already rebuilt two thirds of the buildings destroyed by the Germans! The man who made the diagram has laid out his measurements along one dimension only and has been grossly inaccurate even in that! Even then I find that I have greatly underestimated the impression of magnitude which is conveyed to me by this figure of the house. For one thing houses have three dimensions, not two; and when I look at it I see it as a solid, not as a plane surface. When therefore I look at this large house as representing "what remains to do" I see an amount which is just sixteen times the number which I get when I actually study the figures. As if such exaggeration were not sufficient, the impression of magnitude is still further increased by placing the large house in the background so that the influence of perspective comes into play. Altogether therefore the damages to France in number of houses destroyed appears in the diagram as scarcely less than sixty-four times the amount indicated by the figures on which the diagram is based! I then turn over to the next page and find that the same device is employed in the matter of the number of factories destroyed and rebuilt.

I have also examined the map which represents the devastated area. Much of this ground I am well acquainted with. I had ample opportunity to inspect it during my two years' service overseas. I am therefore surprised to find that the devastated area includes all the territory which was at any time covered by the advance of the Germans. My surprise is changed to dismay when I find that "devastation" is specifically defined in the text as "being made unfit for habitation or cultivation." My own observation has told me that a large proportion of this area was scarcely injured at all!

Just a little while after the armistice during the march to the Rhine I was present in Montmédy when President Poincaré made an address to the citizens of that place. After speaking to them of the impression made upon him by the ruined villages and fields he wound up with the promise that Germany would have to pay for everything ("il leur faut tout payer"). His final charge was that they should go home and set down everything they could possibly think of that had been lost or destroyed during the war. "And," he added, "be sure you don't forget a single broken teacup or a single lost spoon, for we will make them pay for everything." I am afraid that in the figures here presented many such items have been included. When therefore the already exaggerated figures of the French are still further magnified by the impressionistic diagram artist, the result is indeed unhappy.

A. T. BOISEN.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Militaristic Textbooks

SIR: Between 1914 and 1918 many writers criticized the militaristic tendencies of certain textbooks used in German schools before the Great War. Probably there was much truth in what these critics of Germany wrote. I do not wish to deny that there was, nor do I wish to defend or even excuse German school authorities for adopting texts imbued with fear and hatred of foreign nations. I wish merely to suggest that texts strongly militaristic in spirit were used in the schools of at least one other nation also. A textbook for boys and girls about 11 to 13 years of age used very widely in French schools for two decades before the war was La Deuxième Année d'Histoire de France, written by Ernest Lavisse, one of France's most noted historians. Note the following translated extract taken from it (pp. 404-406, quoted by W. S. Davis, History of France, pp. 517-519) explaining the French disasters of 1870-71 (The words italicized are printed in heavy type in the original):

"We were beaten because many Frenchmen loved too well the pleasures of peace, the tranquillity which it gives, and the riches which it enables them to procure. They said that an army cost heavily, and that it was better to use the money to build machines for industry than to cast cannon. But war came. Our losses, added to the war indemnity, amounted to at least fifteen billion francs. Our disasters teach us that all economy practised upon the army costs too dearly, and that *France, which has formidable armed neighbors, must place and keep herself in a state to resist them.*

" *We were beaten,* because very many Frenchmen believed there was no need for them to learn the art of being a soldier.

"We were beaten, because very many Frenchmen believed the time for wars was past. They said that men ought to love one another and that a war was a barbarism which dishonored humanity. But the Germans were writing and teaching that war is an honor for humanity and they hated France and never lost an occasion to treat us as hereditary enemies. For a long time they were preparing to make war on France and THEY ARE PREPARING AGAIN. *Our disasters teach us that it is needful to love France above everything else, and then, in the second place only, 'humanity.'"*

During the war we were told that before 1914 France had given up all hope of regaining Alsace-Lorraine. Note the following extracts also taken from M. Lavisse's little text:

"France must renounce all ideas of wars of conquest. But at the peace of Frankfort France had to cede provinces inhabited by 1,500,000 Frenchmen. The Germans have never asked the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine if they wish to become Germans. Since 1871 they have governed our fellow citizens with extreme forms of severity. Every time they have had a chance the Alsatians have proved that their sentiments have not changed. When they have elected deputies to the German parliament they have charged them to protest against the treaty of Frankfort, which has delivered them over to Germany.

"They have proved that they have kept faithfully their attachment to France. *The first duty of France is not to forget Alsace-Lorraine which does not forget her."*

Oxford, Ohio. F. S. RODKEY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A History of the Great War

A History of the Great War, by John Buchan. 4 Vols. Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Company. $20.00.

WHAT one admires in Mr. Buchan himself is his fundamental fairness of character; what one admires in his book is his treatment of England, her statesmen and her people, her generals and her armies, for there to fairness is added an intimate knowledge not only of English soldiers but also of English statesmen. So far as the English effort is concerned, Mr. Buchan has written a vivid page of history.

In spite of the culminating victory there was something tragic in the English effort, the tragedy of hope deferred. First there was Mons, followed, it is true, by the Marne; but the Marne, the decisive battle of the war, was a French victory. Then there was Gallipoli, where a great English triumph, paid for in untold suffering, supported by incomparable fortitude, was only just lost. Then came Jutland, where the German fleet barely escaped a second Trafalgar; but there was no Trafalgar either then or later. And finally there was the Battle of the Somme.

It is in his treatment of Haig throughout, and of the Battle of the Somme in particular, that Mr. Buchan is at his best. He gives you Haig in a series of pictures, unimaginative, slow to learn, but determined and sound. He gives you the Battle of the Somme in its correct proportion to the war.

The Somme was Haig's great effort, and the greatest English effort of the war. It was planned long beforehand, and as everybody knows, little hurried by Verdun. It was hypothecated on French acquiescence both in 1916 and 1917, and was to end, some time in 1917, in a final British victory.

Mr. Buchan calls the Battle of the Somme a cancer eating into the German front, and one has only to consult Ludendorff's book to see that he is right. It was begun with the intention never to stop until victory had been ground out; and Haig's mathematical mind had correctly calculated that Germany had not the men to resist it to the end, provided that British and French pressure was never relaxed.

The first stage of the battle ended well, in the late autumn of 1916. Haig and Joffre know that it had ended well, but both Lloyd George and the French politicians measured it in terms of casualties. They wanted a short cut; they were not ready for the tactics of General Grant.

Haig's plan in the late autumn of 1916, agreed to by Joffre, was simple. His army, with a much smaller French army still cooperating on his right, was to exert pressure throughout the winter, and to attack in earnest on the same front on February 1, 1917. Ludendorff meanwhile was planning his great retreat, but he could not retreat in the face of pressure, or reorganize his broken units before the late spring. The odds were all on Haig.

Then came the unhappy combination of Lloyd George and Nivelle. Nivelle promised a break-through, and Lloyd George jumped at it. Joffre was relieved, Nivelle has his way. Instead of winter pressure on the enemy, Haig had to take over part of the French front, while Nivelle prepared for a great enterprise farther east. Ludendorff made good his retreat, and there was no continuation of the Battle of the Somme.

So passed the last chance of a predominating English victory, like her old continental victories of the past. Mr. Buchan states flatly his opinion that victory was in Haig's grasp, only to be taken from him by Lloyd George's fanciful imagination added to Nivelle's promises to turn it into a French victory at a smaller cost, and it is probable that the military historians of the future will agree with Mr. Buchan, in spite of the diminishing Russian pressure in 1917. It is hard on England, hard on Haig, that England's enormous, concentrated effort was never at any time rewarded as it might have been. For the final victory, like the victory of the Marne, was won under the command of a Frenchman.

As Mr. Buchan continues to follow Haig's fortunes, he does not slur over that general's mistakes. He shows you Haig under every conceivable blow of fortune, methodical and determined as ever, but often mistaken and slow to understand and follow German innovations—the very opposite of a genius. He shows you Haig at Passchendaele, unable to overcome Armin's pill-boxes and defence in depth. He shows you Haig at Cambrai trying to obtain a victory beyond his grasp. He shows you Haig unable to understand Hutier's attack methods in the German counter-stroke at Cambrai, something which contributed in 1918 to the loss of Gough's army. And finally he shows you Haig, having learned his various lessons, soundly doing his part in the final victory of Foch. When Mr. Buchan has quite finished with Haig, one seems to see in him the attributes of England—courage, good sense, dogged perseverance, with no flights of genius, but with something perhaps more permanently successful over long periods of time. It is an interesting picture, fair to Haig and to his English army.

As much to English statesmen as to English generals, Mr. Buchan is remarkably fair, kind without sentimentality. He never forgets that men as different as Winston Churchill and Arthur Henderson, Kitchener and Asquith, were doing their best, each according to his lights, to win the war. Of them all he draws quite remarkable pictures, pictures which are among the best things in his book, but which unfortunately cannot be quoted, on account of their length. Mr. Buchan does not try to be terse and epigrammatic, he tries to be true; and it would not be just to him to quote his pictures in part.

Equally fair is his treatment of capital and labor in their relation to the war, of jusqu'auboutistes and pacifists, both of the conscientious and Landsdowne variety. Equally fair—and of particular interest—is his description of incidents like the occasion when Asquith allowed himself to be jockeyed out of the premiership. In fact, taken as a whole, his history of England in the war has not so far been equalled.

His fundamental quality of fairness is especially valuable in his treatment of the Germans. He is essentially sportsmanlike. He notes the aggregate valor of the German army, as in the behavior of the majority of units in September and October 1918, when hope was utterly gone. He notes the behavior of the German air service, and of many of her seamen. He wants to think the best of the Germans; indeed, he is frankly pleased to record the conduct of that German artillery officer in Byng's Cambrai attack, who single-handed served his gun against the English tanks until he was killed, and actually saved the day.

Again, in other ways he gives the Germans the credit which is their due. He shows their fertility of resource,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so different from the pig-headed stupidity which was once believed to lie behind their meticulous preparation. He shows Armin's defence in depth at Passchendaele, which stopped the English and was copied by them, only to be overwhelmed by another new tactical device—Hutier's method of filtering specially trained "shock" troops through many places of the front at the same time. Again, he says flatly that in subordinate commands—and by subordinate he appears to mean subordinate only to the high command—the Germans were better than any of the Allies from the beginning of the war to the end. Indeed, his love of the sportsmanlike, the decent, and the fair leads him to the omission of many incidents discreditable to the Germans. He does not like to talk about atrocities. He does not mention, for instance, the treatment of English prisoners in 1918 on the River Aa, probably the best attested case in the whole war of deliberate cruelty not due to the initiative of perverted individuals. One feels that he avoids this disagreeable subject as one might avoid an insupportable acquaintance, and tries, after slight mention, in each case to forget its very existence.

His treatment of the French is good, but not quite so good as one would expect of a man who knows the French so well, and appreciates them so much. Sometimes he is penetrating, as when he states that in the days of the premiership of Clemenceau it was Pétain and not Clemenceau who best represented the French people. But the pictures of Briand, even of Joffre and Foch, do not live as do the pictures of Lloyd George, Haig and Kitchener. Perhaps he did not know them in the same intimate way.

Again, while he realizes Pétain's services to the French army after the lowering of morale due to Nivelle's fiasco, he does not sufficiently praise Clemenceau's services to French civilian morale during the same period, or the great moral courage which Clemenceau's course demanded. It was fairly acceptable for Pétain the soldier to be high-handed; Pétain's conscientiousness was a proverb among his troops, and tallied, as Mr. Buchan says, with the new French spirit, the spirit of Verdun; but Clemenceau had to deal with a very different, and far less tractable disaffection behind the lines, which was eating into the vitals of the country. Only a man quite fearless of all opposition could have done what Clemenceau did.

In dealing with some of the other countries in the war Mr. Buchan shows a certain unevenness. In describing Russia during 1917 and 1918 he is good; but in the earlier part of the war his comments—easily accepted before the Revolution—read strangely now. For instance, he says over and over again that the Russian peasant soldiers knew what they were fighting for, when most probably they were fighting out of sheer obedience. Again, he talks of Rumanian public opinion demanding war on the side of the Allies in 1916. It was one of the foibles of the French and British governments of those days to insist that countries fighting on their side were driven on by a united opinion, while countries fighting against them were oppressed by tyrants; but this point of view is hardly supportable today. In a country like Rumania with almost no middle class, and with an enormously predominating peasant population, almost entirely illiterate, without effective electoral rights, and often living practically as serfs, public opinion simply does not exist in any civilized sense of the term. Rumania entered the war because her politicians thought it was the right time to jump, and for no other reason whatever. As for Mr. Buchan's treatment of American public opinion before 1917, readers must judge for themselves.

We have already noted the excellence of Mr. Buchan's account of English campaigns, like the Somme; the standard is not so high throughout campaigns in which the English had no part. But his description of the American battle between the Argonne and the Meuse is perfectly just; he notes the topographical and transport difficulties, and particularly the wisdom of Pershing's decision to use partly trained divisions at that stage of the campaign, in order the more quickly to reach the east to west railway and to end the war. He misses little or nothing in the American effort, not overlooking, for instance, isolated incidents like the remarkable achievement of the 2nd Division at Blanc Mont; and throughout he shows that he regards the fighting value of American infantry as unexcelled.

Mr. Buchan's shortcomings seem usually to be those of omission. He leaves a good deal out of the German campaign which ended at the Marne in 1914. He barely mentions the German order of August 27th to send six corps, of which two went, from west to east, an order which was caused by overconfidence, not by Russian pressure, as Mr. Buchan implies, and which had consequences fatal to Germany. Mr. Buchan likewise does not dwell on Moltke's changes in the Schlieffen plan, or mention his failure, noted by General Berthaut, to transfer troops in August from his left to his right wing, for whom his original plan had provided rolling stock. The failure to do this was also brought about by over-confidence.

Elsewhere Mr. Buchan states that the morale of the French armies under Nivelle was affected, *before the attack*, by knowledge of the political and military conferences to which Nivelle was called and at which the success of his coming effort was questioned. Now Mr. Buchan believes that a present day historian has predominating advantages over the historian of the future, and admits only that the detailed account of this or that battle may be altered in view of new information, as it comes to light. Take the case of the morale of the French armies in 1917. Mr. Buchan thinks that they went into Nivelle's action with their morale impaired. General Maurice states explicitly that they did not, that they knew nothing at all about Nivelle's difficulties. But this is an immensely important detail, if we regard military history as a book from which the officers of the future are to learn their lessons. For the question is, did low morale have anything to do with Nivelle's defeat, or did Nivelle's defeat cause the mutinies and other troubles of the French armies during the following six months? In such a case as this, no historian ought to make a statement open to doubt, for the bearing of the event is of too great importance.

The present reviewer does not regard himself as qualified to criticize in detail more than one or two of the compaigns of the great war. But the truth is that in dealing with so much material Mr. Buchan, conscientious and fair as he is, has attempted to perform single-handed the work of a first-class military staff, such as served for the war edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. It can not be denied that this staff, consisting as it did of generals and general staff officers of both the Allied and German armies, had overwhelming advantages over Mr. Buchan in military matters.

X.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Settlement Horizon

The Settlement Horizon, by Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. $3.00.

THE authors of this book have achieved results which might have been termed amazing were it not for the fact revealed in the preface of arduous labor, extraordinary fidelity to a cause precious to them, and painstaking accumulation of data obtained in many instances because of their personal contacts with the settlements and the people responsible for them.

They visited no fewer than 400 of the 500 settlements in the United States and were kept "continuously in a rare atmosphere of loyalty to Settlement aims." They had frequent opportunities of conferences with men and women who "possess that decisive acquaintance with the settlement which comes to its sagacious neighbors." As joint secretaries for ten years of the National Federation of Settlements the authors were acquainted with developments and specific experiences and the "most timely precipitants of conviction and purpose" from year to year.

And these opportunities were not limited to the United States but extended to many foreign countries. One or the other has visited the original as well as the more recent English establishments and has seen the embodiments of settlement motive that are now springing up at various points on the continent of Europe and in the Orient. The scope of the studies which make the book is indicated by the index and the table of contents. They show a range almost as wide as civilization and give a glimpse of activities that to the uninitiate might seem remotely related to the more obvious localized neighborhood activities.

But the origins of the settlements in England show the lofty revolutionary spirit of those who, as Canon Barnett said, had a "genuine desire to understand life and to foster its highest and most democratic expressions." Out of their guarded university anchorages they sought genuine human fellowship with the many men and women whose homes and lives, as revealed in industrial reports and social disturbing rumors, were untouched by the increasing wealth and privileges of the few. And in the United States the impulse to live in industrial neighborhoods came to the settlement pioneers because of similar disquietude that definite stratifications along economic lines had developed, making "neighbor," in the big cities more particularly, almost obsolete. "Foreign quarters" appeared and the exposure of the strangers to exploitation, often from their own people, and their unacquaintance with natives of their new home stimulated the urge among the more sensitive democratically minded men and women to share their spiritual and cultural privileges with the larger groups. "Sharing" readily changed to the more fitting word "exchanging."

But the people to be served by the settlement were often inarticulate and Mr. Woods and Mr. Kennedy show from chapter to chapter how needed measures for social welfare have therefore been developed here and there, either originating in the settlements or supported by them. They show a cross section of participation and interest in almost every measure for the development of the race and attempted solution of social problems.

Throughout the book, the authors indicate the Settlement technique: the approach from the concrete to the general; how scientific and important discoveries can be applied to the daily life of people and from their personal experience an understanding of the logical development to society at large. This not unexpectedly discloses the most immediate and practical results in matters of hygiene and health.

> The hygienic impact of the future must be first of all in family groups, because contact of individual with individual is closer in the home than at any other point of community life. It is within families that the technique of household care and nursing, and those habits of bodily cleanliness upon which sound personal and community well-being in the last resort depend, must be developed.

But however gratifying to the neighborhood house the effects upon individuals and family standards are, the settlement experience at every point has shown that the better standard never becomes secure until neighbors conspire together to see that it is maintained. As the standard rises, such collective sentiment is increasingly necessary to secure as well as to hold the gains made.

The book is the valuable contribution to social experience for which we habitually look to English writers on contemporary industrial and social life. It is quite free from jargon—better than that, it is written vividly, with something of the sustained charm to which Miss Addams and other interpreters of the settlements and their neighborhoods have long accustomed the reader. So timely, important and careful a volume will be a permanent book for reference and a textbook for students and social workers.

With the many causes for indebtedness to the authors it may seem ungracious to ask for more, but the book, written with such copious wealth of detail and description of origin, background and development—material and spiritual—of urban experiments, leaves the reader with a desire to be informed also of the rural neighborhood ventures in mountains and camps: to know something more of the settlement experiences with the Negroes and perhaps to receive direction or suggestion for adventurous souls to localities awaiting their coming. The desire for more stirs the hope that this may be the first of a series of decennial surveys of our broad land from the settlement point of view—a desire that rises from the deep roots of faith in a democratic institution, the aspirations and applications of this faith finely transmuted into expression with which the volume closes.

> The settlement must therefore all the more earnestly apply itself to its great accepted task. This has to do not so much with any of the processes of democracy as with its spirit. A pioneer in constructive social work, it nevertheless is not moved by merely "structural dispositions." It is no respecter of persons. It is not drawn to the "mechanical juxtapositions of individualism"; no more is it the calculating arbitrator between classes. It is not committed to any doctrinal scheme of society, past, present, or future. It seeks only the general good, the widest fulfillment of human faculty; the most creative interplay of human wills. But it is satisfied that good cannot come of itself, or as a mere by-product of economic or political readjustments. As the prefatory suggestion of a vast, enlightened, affirmative adventure in human fellowship, applied at many points of isolation or estrangement, and turning them into gang of practised democratic association, through whi genuinely higher order shall be wrought out, the lement represents some of the focal energies of history and destiny.

LILLIAN D. WALD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cooper's Letters

Correspondence of James Fenimore Cooper, edited by James Fenimore-Cooper. 2 Vols. New Haven: Yale University Press. $7.50.

COOPER'S refusal to authorize any biography and the consequent withholding of personal papers until very lately makes the recent publication of released material specially interesting. Professor Lounsbury's modest volume in the American Men of Letters Series is one of the best members of a group of books which average high; but less than 300 duodecimo pages is too little to have about a man whose works are being widely read a hundred years after the beginning of his authorship. The Lounsbury volume was so well done that the letters now issued do not change the picture or character of the man, but they fill it in, replacing a pencil sketch by a full length portrait.

On his most personal side the Cooper who strides down these pages is the most amiable of men, a loyal friend, a fond father and a very constant lover. He was Patriarch of the Lunch Club of his founding, friend and patron of struggling artists (like Greenough, the sculptor, and S. F. B. Morse the painter who was to be inventor), and support of various dependents whose claims on him had only to be realized to be acknowledged. Intellectually he was first a citizen and second a craftsman; never an artist. He knew Bryant, but had little to do with him and no consecutive correspondence. "Night before last I was at a literary soirée. Bryant, Willis, Gliddon, Dr. Robinson, etc. were there. I was glad to see the two last." Music had no place in his experience, nor poetry, and drama hardly more. "Mrs. Butler (Fanny Kemble) is making a furore up-town, but I seldom go there." "Mrs. Butler has a competitor in a Miss Somebody, who does very well, they say. There is a McReady riot, and likely to be a fight tonight. As I am not in it, I shall not volunteer a broken head." He would not go to hear Jennie Lind on account of the prices, nor even to pay her the compliment of his social greetings: "I was asked, but did not choose to go five miles into the country, of a cold evening, in order to look at a singer of no personal charm."

There is no fund of allusion to literature in general, even to fiction in extensive measure. There is not a reference to any story-writer but Scott, and of the four to him not one that reveals any spontaneous interest in his novels. To Morse he wrote: "The Heidenmauer is not equal to The Bravo, but it is a good book and better than two-thirds of Scott's. They may say it is like his if they please; they have said it of every book I have written, even The Pilot." And to his wife, "By the way, I have been told Scott, while at Naples, declared that a person you love had more genius than any living writer." Only two pieces of literature moved him to enthusiasm in all the length of the volumes. One was his daughter's innocuous Rural Hours: "The purity of mind, the simplicity, elegance and knowledge they manifest, must, I think, produce a strong feeling in your favor with all the pure and good." The other is noted in his diary of March 10, 1848: "Finished Revelations, a most extraordinary book." While the sentiments are commendable in both cases, the range of reading has sometimes been surpassed by men of letters.

In his relations with the outer world he was much more interesting and much less attractive. Like many of his type he was heavy handed and thin skinned, a combination of Dr. Johnson and William Sylvanus Baxter. It disturbed him to be ignored and tried him to be noticed. He lacked genuine self-confidence and was always attempting to reassure himself by self-assertion. He made hard work of living because he was the incarnation of a crude but hypersensitive young country. In 1825 when he went abroad with his family for his seven-year residence he was belligerently resolved not "to be caught nor to be awed by airs"; and apparently believing that the best defence is a good offence, he put airs on, himself. "There are a few English who pass you as if they were afraid some tailor had broke loose, and always look the other way until you are past, and then they are always staring after you to see if you are somebody. Our indifferent manner never fails to deceive them." But he was in a dilemma between the annoyance of being mistaken for an Englishman and the ignominy of being taken as a typical American. "As for myself I know nothing of Europe through cafés and valets de place. I make no acquaintances with Countesses in Diligences and do not see Grandees at Restaurateurs, and scarcely know the name of an opera dancer. You see I shall return as ignorant as I came out, at least in the opinion of those galloping gentry . . . our ancient travelled illuminati." When he came back he was in fine fettle to justify Lowell's comment in the Fable for Critics:

> There is one thing in Cooper I like, too, and that is
> That on manners he lectures his countrymen gratis:
> Not precisely so either, because, for a rarity,
> He is paid for his tickets in unpopularity.

Morse had prepared him for the worst: "There is nothing new in New-York, everybody is driving after money, as usual, and there is an alarm of fire every half hour, as usual, and the pigs have the freedom of the city, as usual, so that in these respects at least, you will find New-York as you left it."

He did not expect to find the cultural sophistication of Athens and the moral integrity of Utopia, on his return; yet he was bitterly disappointed not to; and when he spoke his countrymen felt that it was more in anger than in sorrow. He clung to a belief in the fundamental soundness of the country: "I have seen enough to be satisfied that, with the majority of those who affect to have opinions, anti-American sentiments are more in favor than American. The heart of the nation, however, is sound, or else God knows what would become of us." "Every hour I stay at home convinces me more and more that society has had a summerset, and that the élite is at the bottom." Naturally enough the "upper ten thousand" attacked him; there followed libel suit after libel suit with Cooper almost invariably winner, but winner with a sore heart. As early as 1834 he wrote, "Thank God I am still young, and in the full vigor of both mind and body, and I do not see but some gentlemanly and suitable competence may yet offer to take the place of that from which I am driven by my own country. In the last event I can return to Europe, and continue to write, for in that quarter of the world I am at least treated with common decency."

In his campaign for freedom of speech during the next eight years, Cooper's experience was typical. He was unusual first of all in having a mind independent enough to disagree with the majority even in silence. He was more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unusual still in having the courage to disagree aloud. When he had said his say his neighbors began to carp at him, respectable people to pass by on the other side, and the newspapers to distort what he had said, and then to abuse him for what he had never said at all. Stung to the quick, injured and innocent, but tragically indiscreet, he soon was almost an outcast. For a while he had the courage and honesty with which he started, a circle of friends, some sympathetic, some deprecatory, and a thousand enemies who hated him with an honest and totally unjustified hatred. It is a sad round which all but the most extraordinary of free speakers seem doomed to travel. And Cooper did not escape it. Yet he did have the strength and good fortune to pass clear through the vale of recriminations. With 1842 his campaign against the public ceased—and theirs against him. He spent the last years happily at Cooperstown, and slowly returned into an era of good feeling.

It is Cooper the turbulent patriot, rather than Cooper the author who is revealed in the Correspondence.

PERCY H. BOYNTON.

English Wall Shadows

English Prisons Under Local Government, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, with a preface by Bernard Shaw. London: Longmans, Green and Company. $5.00.

English Prisons To-Day: Report of the Prison System Enquiry Committee, edited by Stephen Hobhouse and A. Fenner Brockway. London: Longmans, Green and Company. $7.50.

A NUMBER of events and documents, such as riots at the Joliet Prison in Illinois and the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania, the investigations of state penal systems in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and New York, the revelation of atrocious methods in our federal prisons, and the writings of men like Lewis, Osborne and Tannenbaum have recently served to remind thoughtful and informed Americans that all is not well with *our* prison system. We have, however, generally shared the belief that the English penal organization and administration—the product of the cumulative efforts of Howard, Bentham, Romilly, Buxton, Miss Fry, Whatley, Crawford, Macononochie, Crofton, the Hills, DuCane and Ruggles-Brise—is an admirably conceived, smoothly operating and conspicuously efficient system for the detention and reformation of those guilty of anti-social action. Now we are shocked out of this amiable illusion by two comprehensive and authoritative volumes which constitute a most thorough-going indictment of the whole English prison system on the basis of its historical development, of an elaborate cross-section of the methods of today, and of a penetrating analysis of the whole foundation of the prevailing English theory and practice of criminology and penology. Not that these volumes prove the English system worse than those of most other Western countries. It is unquestionably one of the best of the contemporary examples of penal agencies. What is achieved is an incontrovertible arraignment of the anachronistic, wrong-headed and utterly unscientific nature of our whole body of conventional concepts and practices concerning the nature of the criminal and the desirable modes of treating him. These works should constitute a landmark in the literature of English penology comparable to that of the writings of Howard, Blackstone, Bentham and Romilly, which sounded the requiem of the old pre-prison system of torture, mutilation and transportation.

Probably the most striking section in these significant volumes is the brilliant Preface of seventy-three pages by Bernard Shaw, in which he generously devotes the great resources of his intellectual courage, analytical acumen and trenchant phraseology to the cause of the reconstruction of our notions concerning crime, the criminal and prison methods. Mr. Shaw was a member of the Prison Enquiry Committee, the results of whose labors are gathered in coherent form in the volume edited by Hobhouse and Brockway, and, with characteristic energy, he seems to have acquainted himself with both the concrete facts and the significant auxiliary scientific literature necessary to equip himself for the task. Consequently, it contains little nonsense, and is unquestionably the most brilliant impeachment of the conventional views and the most lucid and compelling summary of the newer attitudes which has yet appeared in any language. He indicts the brutal terroristic methods, riddles the arguments for the three basic conventional aims of imprisonment, and proves the utter futility of modern prisons in securing reformation and their deadly effectiveness in producing the complete degradation and demoralization of the prisoners. He argues that the root of the evil is "the belief that virtue is something which can be imposed upon us from without, like the tricks taught a performing animal, by the whip." The chief vice of the penal system which grows out of this attitude is "the anti-Christian vice of vengeance, or the intentional duplication of malicious injuries in compliance with the expiatory superstition that two blacks make a white." We must completely abandon the whole notion of punishment, segregate or exterminate the abnormal habitual criminals, educate those that must be temporarily restrained for the life of the law-abiding citizen through the enjoyment of normal liberties, and fine rather than imprison those whose incarceration is not rendered necessary in the interest of public safety. Above all, we must be relentlessly logical and inclusive in applying the test of anti-social action as the criterion for establishing the existence of criminality. The most brilliant passages in Mr. Shaw's Preface are those in which he compares the gentleman and the criminal, with results disastrous to the reputation of the former.

> We may take it, then, that the thief who is in prison is not necessarily more dishonest than his fellows at large, but mostly one who, through ignorance or stupidity, steals in a way that is not customary. He snatches a loaf from the baker's counter and is promptly run into gaol. Another man snatches bread from the tables of hundreds of widows and orphans and simple credulous souls who do not know the ways of company promoters; and, as likely as not, he is run into Parliament. . . . We have whole classes of persons who waste, squander, and luxuriate in the hard earned income of the nation without even a pretense of social service or contribution of any kind; and instead of sternly calling on them to justify their existence or go to the scrap heap, we encourage and honor them, and indeed conduct the whole business of the country as if its object were to produce and pamper them. How can a prison chaplain appeal with any effect to the conscience of the professional criminal who knows quite well that his illegal and impecunious modes of preying on society are no worse morally, and enormously less mischievous materially, than the self-legalized plutocratic modes practised by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chaplain's most honored friends with the chaplain's full approval? . . . How is the divine judgment, by which all mankind must finally stand or fall, to distinguish between the victims of these two bragging predatory insects, the criminal and the gentleman? The most obvious reply is "By their number." For the depredations of the criminal are negligibly small compared to the military holocausts and ravaged areas, the civic slums, the hospitals, the cemeteries crowded with prematurely dead, the labor markets in which men and women are exposed for sale for all purposes, honorable and dishonorable, which are the products of criminal ideals imposed on the whole population. . . . The gentleman really believes that he is an instrument of national honor, a defender of the faith, a pillar of society; and with this conviction to strengthen him he is utterly unscrupulous in his misplaced pride and honor, and plays the wholesaler in evil to the criminal's petty retail enterprises.

The historical monograph by the Webbs and the voluminous descriptive report of the Prison Enquiry Committee will be of less interest to the general reader than to the technical student of social and administrative history and to the penologist. It will be sufficient to state that the history is fully up to the standard set by Mr. and Mrs. Webb in their earlier monographs, which have won for them the undisputed place as the leading contributors to institutional economics and sociology among writers in the English language. It treats of the history of English prisons from the vague anticipations of a prison system in the sixteenth century to the application of the important Prisons Act of 1877, which transferred the control from local government agencies to the central authorities. Particularly important are the first eight chapters, which describe the transition from corporal punishment to incarceration in England. For the first time the significant facts of this important revolution in the treatment of crime have been authoritatively summarized. This monograph finds its logical sequel in English Prisons To-Day.

The cross-section of actual English penology as it exists today, which has been edited by Hobhouse and Brockway, is a voluminous work of some 728 pages. With the possible exception of the Report of the New Jersey Prison Inquiry Commission, executed under the direction of Mr. Dwight W. Morrow a few years ago, it is doubtful if another collection of concrete material concerning contemporary prisons of equal scope and content has appeared. Not only does it present with candid thoroughness every aspect of the existing methods and administration in the English prison system, but it also includes references to advanced experiments made elsewhere in the newer penology, particularly in the United States. It would appear that some of the members of the Committee may have cherished the opinion that the United States has a civilized prison system. That the Committee has no illusions concerning their own is apparent from the concluding words of the Chairman:

> In our prisons we put away men for our own convenience, and, for the sake of financial economy, control them by mechanical methods which not only deteriorate their own characters and dissipate their inheritance in humanity, but in a majority of cases ensure that if we release them we shall have to put them away again, and continue the process of their destruction till nothing but animal life can be said to remain to them.

If pertinent information can achieve anything for human betterment, then the end of the repressive prison system in England should verily be in sight. But facts, unfortunately, in spite of the hopes of enlightened philosophers from Bacon to Lester F. Ward, have rarely proved efficacious in the way of inducing desirable social reforms until they have been integrated in public opinion through a persistent campaign of social education. A reprinting of Mr. Shaw's Preface and its wide circulation as an educational pamphlet should do much to awaken the English conscience to the pressing need of a thorough reconstruction of the existing theory and practice of penal "science."

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

Where Do We Go from Here?

The Undertaker's Garland, by John Peale Bishop and Edmund Wilson, Jr., with decorations by Boris Artzybasheff. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.00.

THE Undertaker's Garland is a collection of pieces, some in verse and some in prose, all of which are in fact as well as in intention related to a central idea expressed by the contemplation of death. Mr. Wilson has unfortunately written a preface which shows his fear that this idea stood in need of explanation and in doing so has conveyed to the reader a sense of the weakness of the book. It indicates that Mr. Wilson felt the need of explaining something to himself. I believe that he was trying to explain why two young men should need to be so unbelievably grave.

Most of the verse is by Mr. Bishop and I must confess that with few exceptions it leaves me cold. His concern is with the richness of sensible impressions and his ability to endow his work with shape and color is great, but with the possible exception of The Death of God all of his poems included in this volume seem to be inchoate and without the matrix of creative understanding. The Death of St. Mary Magdalene is entirely without distinction, and Resurrection, Mr. Bishop's other prose piece, suffers grievously from proximity to Mr. Wilson's fine Death of a Soldier.

Mr. Wilson's verse is at times heavy but it has at other times a real quality of emotion. The Death of the Last Centaur is particularly strong. The Death of an Efficiency Expert is a kind of Victrolesque representation of the moment, which perhaps intentionally suggests Mr. Edgar Lee Masters at his worst. The Funeral of a Romantic Poet is much too long and too expressionless. The real strength of the book is in Mr. Wilson's two prose pieces, The Death of a Soldier and Emily in Hades, not because these are Mr. Wilson speaking instead of Mr. Wilson broadcasting so much as because the mere fact of speaking has given him poise and strength and has removed the trammels from his art. Whatever may be the value of improvisation in literature Mr. Wilson should realize that it cannot be successfully dealt with in the terms which best express the reality of the passion of the mind. Emily in Hades is as moving a piece of prose as one could find in a considerable search. It suggests the power of Mr. Wilson's sensibilities and the sense of his intelligence. It has dignity and fineness, color and strength. It is a genuine achievement.

As a whole The Undertaker's Garland is a highly interesting and a significant piece of work. Is it too much to hope that its publication comes at the beginning of an era during which Americans will attend to things timely only to the soul and so fill their world with books destined to satisfy the hungers and not the exasperations of human life?

RAYMOND HOLDEN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Next Step

The Next Step, by Scott Nearing. New York: Nellie S. Nearing. $1.00.

THE Next Step turns out to be a very long jump indeed—nothing less than a plan for the economic administration of the whole world. Taking Graham Wallas as a text, "Men cannot exist in their present numbers on the earth without world cooperation," Mr. Nearing proceeds to outline the fundamental principles upon which such world cooperation should be based, and to line in some of the more obvious machinery. We are even told that the Industrial Congress should meet in January in order to clear the decks for the World Parliament in July.

There have been other plans for the Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World, but few which have been founded upon such wide knowledge of both the necessity for an economic synthesis and the methods of social control already experimented with. A lot of water has gone under the bridges since Wells wrote A Modern Utopia, and Mr. Nearing has done considerable swimming. He has gathered the available evidence, both economic and psychological, and built a jumping-off place which has all the appearance of solidity.

But when he does his swan dive into the dizzy abyss of the future, one can only commend a daring man without having the slightest confidence in how he is going to land. We know—as he himself is at pains to point out—too little about social psychology to more than guess as to our future institutions. The guessing in The Next Step is on a level with the guesses of the guildsmen in England, and it goes them one better in geographical extent. It is withal very necessary and very stimulating guessing, and part of the essential groundwork which must be covered before we may some day come to terms with our environment.

STUART CHASE.

Contributors

ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE was a member of the Middle Eastern Section of the British delegation at the Peace Conference. He is the author of Nationality and the War, The New Europe, The Western Question in Turkey and Greece, etc.

LILLIAN SEGALL KOPELOFF is director in charge of the research department of biological chemistry at the New York State Psychiatric Institute.

NICHOLAS KOPELOFF is in charge of the research department of bacteriology of the same institution.

AUSTIN HAINES is a journalist of wide experience, at present editor of the Des Moines Daily News.

JOSEPH AUSLANDER teaches in the English department of Harvard University.

THOMAS CRAVEN is the author of numerous articles on aesthetics which have appeared in the New Republic and other contemporary journals, and of one novel, Paint, which has just been published by Harcourt, Brace and Company.

LILLIAN D. WALD is a sociologist active in child welfare and settlement work. She founded the Henry Street Settlement, New York City, and is its director. She is the author of The House on Henry Street, etc.

PERCY H. BOYNTON is a professor in the English department of Chicago University and the author of London in English Literature and A History of American Literature.

HARRY ELMER BARNES is professor of the history of thought at Clark University and a member of the teaching staff of the New School for Social Research. He is the author of A Social History of the Western World, Sociology and Political Theory, etc.

RAYMOND HOLDEN has published one volume of verse, Granite and Alabaster, and has contributed book reviews and special articles to the New Republic and other periodicals.

STUART CHASE is expert accountant for the Labor Bureau, New York.

A TRAVEL SERVICE

for

New Republic Readers

IN order to be in a position to extend counsel and assistance to its large travelling public The New Republic has instituted a Readers' Travel Service Department, which is prepared to supply information and data to travellers.

If we don't know, we'll try to find out.

The service of this department is placed at the disposal of New Republic readers in the hope that they will avail themselves of it freely.

So, whether you are planning to travel in the Old World or the New, in this country or another, call upon us to advise with you.

Addresss:

TRAVEL SERVICE DEPARTMENT

The New Republic. 421 West 21st St., New York City

Tainted News

The end of the war did not see the end of propaganda.

Today distorted news is still being employed to create class hatred and foment strife within and without the nations.

The Manchester Guardian Weekly

gives in concise form all the important news of the world without distortion or suppression of FACTS.

Week by week it also has an unbiased discussion of international politics and a full book review that keeps the reader posted on the best in the current literature of all countries.

An hour or two of time spent each week with The Manchester Guardian Weekly keeps a man's knowledge of the world in repair and equips him to judge for himself what in the history of his own time is of enduring value.

— — — — — — MAIL COUPON BELOW — — — — — —

To THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN
222 West 42nd St.,
New York City.

I enclose three dollars for a year's subscription to THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN WEEKLY, to be mailed to me direct from Manchester, England, commencing with the current issue.

Name .....

Address .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Says Professor

Harry F. Ward

Professor of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary

"I consider The Christian Century the most promising venture in the field of religious journalism in the English-speaking world."

EDITORIAL STAFF

Charles Clayton Morrison

Herbert L. Willett — Orvis F. Jordan
Joseph Fort Newton — John R. Ewers
Lynn Harold Hough — Edward Shillito
Alva W. Taylor — Thomas C. Clark

The Christian Century is distinguished by its candid discussion of living issues in the light of the mind of Christ

Mail Coupon to-day. Foreign postage extra

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY
508 S.Dearborn St., Chicago

Dear Sirs: Please enter my name (a new subscriber) for a year's subscription to The Christian Century at your regular rate of $4.00 (ministers $3.00). I will remit upon receipt of bill and you will please send me without extra charge a copy of ☐ "The Reconstruction of Religion," by Ellwood, or ☐ "The Crisis of the Churches," by Leighton Parks, or ☐ "The Mind in the Making," by Robinson, or ☐ "What Christianity Means to Me," by Lyman Abbott.

Name .....

Address .....

N.R.

CHANGE OF POSITION DESIRED. Experience in editing and research. International material preferred. Address Box 203, New Republic.

Brentano's
NEW YORK
5th Ave at 27th ST
Booksellers to the World
Mail-Telephone Cable-Telegraph
ALL BOOKS ALL LANGUAGES

The State and the Schools

With special reference to recent legislation in Oregon and in New York.

DINNER MEETING:

Teachers Union Auxiliary
Thursday, February 15th, at 7 P. M.
(Fifth Avenue Restaurant)

SPEAKERS:

Dr. John A. Ryan, Director National Catholic Welfare Council
Professor John Dewey, Columbia University
Dr. Henry Neumann, Leader, Brooklyn Ethical Society

Three Dollars per Cover
TEACHERS UNION AUXILIARY
70 Fifth Avenue, New York

Are You A Husband? is a 40-page booklet dealing with marriage as it has developed in this country in the past 50 years. It gives a tip to married men (and to those about to be) just where they stand under the law today. Women will not like the booklet because it exposes their game. If a man wishes to know in what a network of law and custom in this age of feminism he and his sons may expect to find themselves in the process anciently expressed as taking unto oneself a wife, the facts and analyses in this pamphlet give more than a hint. 25c postpaid. 1c and 2c stamps accepted. Remaley's Book Store, 248 Main St., Portland, Oregon.

LABOR TEMPLE
14th Street and 2nd Avenue

"FORCES IN AMERICAN LIFE"

Six lectures analyzing the factors that have formed the contemporary American mind.

By DR. HENRY NEUMANN
Leader, Brooklyn Society for Ethical Culture

WEDNESDAYS AT 8.30 P. M.

Feb. 14: Puritanism — Mar. 7: Business Ideas
Feb. 21: Nationalism — Mar. 14: Democracy
Feb. 28: Modern Science — Mar. 21: Our Public Schools

Single admission, 25 cents

On Mar. 28th Dr. Will Durant will resume his "Outline of History" with a lecture on "The Rise of Napoleon." Course tickets for last 15 lectures. $2.00.

FRENCH
Practical brief course
in your home,
Especially useful for
A VISIT TO FRANCE.
Address Box 201, New Republic.

A TEACHER of long experience with boys, who proposes to open a Country Day School next fall, invites correspondence with communities which feel the need of such a school. Address Box 198, The New Republic, 421 W. 21st St., N. Y. City.

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!
We have over 1,000,000 (Secondhand and New) on every conceivable subject in stock. On approval. Also Rare Books and Sets of Authors. Catalogues free. Mention requirements. Commissions executed.
FOYLES, 121 Charing Cross Road, London, Eng.

THE PEOPLES INSTITUTE
COOPER UNION
8 o'clock

Friday Eve., Feb. 16—Everett Dean Martin: "The New Liberalism and Education."
Sunday Eve., Feb. 18—Horace Bridges: "Mr. H. G. Wells and the Use of History."
Tuesday Eve., Feb. 20—Prof. James Harvey Robinson: "Our Present Predicament."

The Modern Quarterly

A Magazine that is infinitely above

The Modern Quarterly is the newest and biggest intellectual magazine in America. It is thoroughly metaphysical and radical in its attack. It will not stand for any mental limits.

A special article in its first issue shows where and how magazines like The New Republic, Nation, Freeman and Dial have definite and harmful limits for them.

THE SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM
by Eli Siegel

another of the articles, is the most brilliant thing on criticism since Vache.

THE GREAT MAN ILLUSION
by V. F. Calverton

is a psychological study in education that is more original than any thing of its kind that has appeared.

Besides

THE COMPLETE SOCIALISM

there will be articles by SCOTT NEARING, GERARD GOULD and UPTON SINCLAIR.

One year's subscription $1.00 *Single copy* 25c.

SPECIAL OFFER

Upton Sinclair's Cry for Justice.....$1.50
THE MODERN QUARTERLY 1.00
$2.50
Both for 1.85

— — — — — — MAIL THIS — — — — — —

MODERN QUARTERLY
P. O. Box 322, Baltimore, Md.

I enclose: $1.85 one year and book
1.00 one year
.25 single copy

Name .....

Address .....

"LET FRANCE EXPLAIN"

by Frederick Bausman

The general public will here first see the Franco-Russian diplomatic correspondence, revealed by the Bolsheviks.

These astonishing documents disclose the determination of Russia to attack Germany, the agreement of France to join her, the confidence of Poincaré, the corruption of the French press by Russia and *the division of Germany agreed on by France in* 1917.

Germany by the Franco-Russian treaty must "defend on the East and the West at the same time."

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN
London
Publishers

BEYER'S BOOKSTORE
207 Fulton St.
New York

$3.25 postpaid

NATIONAL SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATION with local constituency throughout country desires young man who has brains and knows how to use press, magazines, pamphlets, posters, exhibits and graphic arts to develop educational and publicity program for national organization and advise local societies on same subjects. State education and experience fully. Address Box 202, The New Republic.

BETTER EYESIGHT

A monthly magazine devoted to the prevention and cure of imperfect sight by treatment without glasses. *W. H. Bates, M.D., Editor.* Published by the

Central Fixation Publishing Company
300 Madison Avenue, New York

Price $2.00 *a year* *Sample copies FREE*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED